FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 079 *23 April 1984*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

PRAVDA Finds Absurdity in Bush CW Proposal AA 1
[Editorial Article, 22 Apr]
Soltan: CW Proposals Obviously Unacceptable AA 2
U.S. Nonratification of Arms Treaties Hit AA 3
[Ganzha in IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]
PRAVDA Editorializes on Soviet Peace Policy AA 6
[20 Apr]
NEW TIMES Assesses Confidence-Building Forums AA 8
[Alekseyev, No 14]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers' Communique BB 1
Varkonyi Comments [Bolinov] BB 5
Kornilov Commentary BB 6
Olenichev on Meeting BB 7
Levin Commentary BB 8

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Gerasimov, Tsvetov, Sobolev]
Warsaw Pact Communique; CW Ban CC 1
Nuclear-Free Zones CC 3
U.S.' Pacific Orientation CC 5
Central America CC 6
Criticism of L.A. Olympics' Management, Cost CC 8
Borisov: Most Expensive Ever CC 8
LAOOC 'Scandals' Scored CC 9
Peace Committee Chief Zhukov Speaks on TV CC 10
U.S. Obstructs Progress at UN ECE Session CC 10
[Kuznetsov in IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Maneuvers Seen as Real Rehearsal for War A 1
[Gavrilov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Apr]
Ponomarev: Washington Deaf to Soviet Proposals A 2
Treatment of Soviets in U.S. Criticized A 3

CHINA

PRC's Historic Claims to USSR Territory Refuted B 1
[Yasenev in NEW TIMES No 15]
Wu Xueqian Tries To Whitewash U.S. Missile Policy B 5
UK Minister in PRC for Talks on Hong Kong B 6
Chinese Artist's Birthday Marked in Moscow B 6
Soviet Gymnasts Lose to Chinese in Beijing B 6
Briefs: Sino-Russian Dictionary B 6

NORTHEAST ASIA

Soviet Far East-Hokkaido Amity Meeting Concludes C 1
Vorotnikov Sends Greetings C 1
Communique Issued C 1
USSR-Japan Talks on Salmon Fishing Open C 2
Trade Minister Greets Japan Business Executive C 3
New Japanese Arms Build-up Program Examined C 3
'Accomplice' Role Seen C 3
[Logachov]
Military Satellites Featured C 4
Nuriyev Greets MPR Council of Ministers' Maydar C 4
[PRAVDA 18 Apr]
DPRK Military Attache Holds Press Conference C 4
DPRK Youth Art Troupe Visits Soviet Union C 4

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

PRK Foreign Ministry Warns Thais on Pol Pot Aid E 1
U.S. Arms for ASEAN Directed Against Indochina E 1
[Alekseyev]
U.S. 'Unlawful Conduct' in Micronesia Criticized E 3
[Valentinov]

EASTERN EUROPE

Poland's Siwicki, Delegation Conclude Visit F 1
Visit Armored Unit [PAP] F 1
Visitors Depart for Home F 1

Moscow Hails Friendship, Alliance With Poland [Rodionov] F 2
Reception Held for 'Days of Polish Culture' F 3
BTA Statement Denies Missiles in Bulgaria F 3
Bulgarian Party Delegation Visits Kazakhstan F 3
LCY's Markovic Scores Alien Ideas, Vacillation [PRAVDA 19 Apr] F 4

WESTERN EUROPE

Gromyko, Italian Foreign Minister Begin Talks G 1
France Plans Antisatellite Defense System [Tumanov] G 1
French Media Reports on Aeroflot Course 'False' [Dobrov] G 2
U.S. Accused of Trying To Drag Spain Into NATO G 3
FRG Parliamentarian Denies USSR Military Superior G 4
'Mammoth' Antiwar Rally Held in Hamburg G 4
Antiwar Protest March Begins in Belgium G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

British Government Severs Ties With Libya H 1
Jerusalem Committee Meeting in Fes Concludes H 1
Egypt Severs Ties With El Salvador, Costa Rica H 1

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Soviet, Indian Cosmonauts Hold Press Conference U 1
Orbiting Cosmonauts Continue Activities U 2
Perform 4-Hour Space Walk U 2
'Gorizont' Communications Satellite Launched U 3
Armenian Science Academy Holds Annual Meeting [SOVETAKAN AYASTAN 31 Mar] U 3
Briefs: Awards to Academician Tselikov U 5

PRAVDA FINDS ABSURDITY IN BUSH CW PROPOSAL

PM211835 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 84 First Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Advertisement and Reality"]

[Text] Washington was for several months whipping up a propaganda campaign, claiming that the United States was about to come up with "revolutionary" proposals on the prohibition of chemical weapons. They were trying to convince the world public that this time, at long last, the U.S. Administration would display a "constructive" and "flexible" approach to the question the solution of which is indeed long overdue.

Now U.S. Vice President George Bush specially came to the Geneva Disarmament Conference to make public the much-touted U.S. proposals.

It turned out that, contrary to all promises, the U.S. obstructionist stand on the prohibition of chemical weapons has changed -- if at all -- not for the better.

The master advertisers, many of whom seem to have moved to the White House or nearby from New York's Madison Avenue, have indeed spared no effort to create the impression that the United States has invented "an absolutely new concept" of the prohibition of chemical weapons.

But what is the essence of that "novelty?" In the past, to block the conclusion of an agreement banning chemical weapons, the United States insisted on a verification system in accordance with which the other states should at the very first request admit foreign inspectors to any chemical plant regardless of whether it was involved in the production of chemical weapons or not. Now Washington suggests that states announce in advance and voluntarily that foreign inspectors will be admitted without hindrance "to any place and at any time."

It is this advertising "scoop," -- "open-invitation inspection" -- that they are trying to pass off as a new word in verification. But one hardly needs much perspicacity to realise that the point is not that verification which is really needed to be confident of the strict observance of agreements -- in which, incidentally, the USSR has a no smaller interest than the United States. The point is that Washington would like to continue blocking an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons by making the demand for free access to the territories of other countries.

To provide itself with something to fall back upon and to make the "new" American concept of verification totally unacceptable, Bush explained that foreign inspectors should have constant and free access only to "government-owned or government-controlled" facilities. In other words, in socialist countries every factory, even the one producing shoe polish, would be subject to verification. As for the United States and other capitalist countries their huge chemical corporations could produce whatever they like, including chemical weapons, quite uncontrollably because they are private property. This also is presented as a "new word."

Leaving aside the absurdity of these proposals on controlling chemical weapons, we must say that there is nothing new in them. Similar proposals were already made by the United States many years ago but were shelved because of their obvious and commonly recognized untenability. Having revived them, Washington is apparently relying on the principle that "there is nothing new but what has been forgotten."

But they should not count on short memories or gullibility. Following Bush's address even those few who perhaps doubted the correctness of U.S. press reports on that score clearly realized one thing: Being basically opposed to the prohibition of chemical weapons, the Pentagon gave its blessing to the White House's "new proposals" only after it had made certain that verification procedures that would be patently unacceptable to the Soviet Union had been included as an integral part of those proposals.

Why then did the U.S. Administration need to enact this show? Obviously to try to camouflage what it is actually doing -- namely, carrying on speedy preparations for fulfilling the $10-billion "chemical rearmament" program announced by President Reagan. Incidentally, it is no one other than Vice President Bush who has responsibility for pushing that program through Congress.

No, the U.S. Administration has no desire to reach an agreement on the prohibition of chemical weapons, or agreements on arms limitations and on disarmament. It is therefore small wonder that Vice President Bush cynically characterized as "pieces of paper" in his address in Geneva all the earlier agreements in that field. Isn't it an indication of the general approach of the incumbent U.S. Administration to international treaties?

SOLTAN: CW PROPOSALS OBVIOUSLY UNACCEPTABLE

LD202045 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Next our observer Yuriy Soltan examines the reaction to the plan America has presented at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, a plan which according to President Reagan opens up a way for ridding mankind once and for all of such a terrible means of destruction as the chemical weapons.

The diplomats are studying the United States proposals. Official answers are yet to come but many observers including those in Western countries have reacted with immediate puzzlement. They're asking, for example, why the White House is so pompously advertising the initiative as its own, as if there had never been the draft convention introduced by the USSR and other socialist countries in the same Geneva back in 1972 calling to impose a full ban on chemical weapons and to abolish all stocks of them.

What has prevented the United States from discussing the draft in a serious manner all these 12 years? Did it ignore it because it didn't want to have its hands tied up? Obviously yes, since it was precisely in the seventies that Washington began to actively replenish its stocks of toxic weapons and conducted a real chemical war in Indochina. One could assume that the American leaders have now started feeling pangs of remorse all of a sudden. But if so why does the United States persist with a program President Reagan announced in February 1982, which allocates more than $10 billion for modernizing America's chemical weaponry? And why does the White House want Congress's approval for the expenditure of more than $1 billion next fiscal year to produce more toxic weapons? Incidentally, Vice President Bush, who brought the American plan to Geneva, had been specially authorized by the White House last year to push through Congress a program for the development of binary chemical weapons. There were two occasions when his vote in the Senate was decisive in securing approval for the allocation of corresponding funds.

Remembering this fact, American journalists in particular note that the officials the Reagan administration has been sending to disarmament talks with the USSR all vehemently oppose any type of agreement.

This was the case when the limitation of European and strategic nuclear weapons was discussed in Geneva, and this was the case this time when Washington chose an emissary for the propaganda of its chemical weapons plan. There is also another circumstance observers have drawn attention to. Under the American draft a limited quantity of combat toxic agents is to be retained allegedly for research. Now what about control? The measures proposed by Washington are extremely unilateral. They would give all-round inspection rights to American specialists but prevent any would-be controllers from entering the factories of private American corporations where chemical agents are produced.

One can only wonder what is the purpose of introducing such obviously unacceptable proposals. Is it to exclude any possibility of agreement? The mass media in various countries have described the American plan on chemical weapons as an election show, a propaganda trick or an attempt to lull world public opinion. Many observers agree that the United States wants to use the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva as a smokescreen to conceal its real intention -- that is, its plans to build up chemical arms and prepare for conducting chemical wars in Europe and in other parts of the world.

U.S. NONRATIFICATION OF ARMS TREATIES HIT

PM191631 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 84 Morning Edition p 5

[V. Ganzha article: "Why Are the Treaties Not Ratified?"]

[Text] The limitation and then the total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests has always been and is still one of the chief tasks in the sphere of ending the nuclear arms race.

The conclusion in 1974 of the treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests was a significant stage on that path. According to its provisions, the sides pledged not to conduct underground tests of nuclear weapons with a yield of more than 150 kilotons. A ban was thereby imposed on tests of ammunition with a large yield, which is thus extremely dangerous to the environment.

Another treaty was concluded between the Soviet Union and the United States in 1976 -- on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, which also limited the yield of nuclear explosions used to resolve various national economic tasks.

In signing those agreements the USSR proceeded from the premise that the establishment of a ceiling of 150 kilotons for nuclear explosions was of great importance since it confined the yields of the nuclear charges being created by the sides within certain limits. In addition, that measure was to be an important step on the way to the speediest attainment of the chief aim -- a total ban on nuclear weapon tests.

Attaching great significance to the limitation of nuclear weapon tests and the validation of the accords reached, the Soviet Union has strictly observed the 1974 and 1976 treaties since the day they were signed, although they still have not been ratified.

This is not how the American side is behaving. Time has shown that these treaties plainly do not suit the United States. The nuclear arms race mounted by the Reagan administration demands tests of ammunition with a greater yield than 150 kilotons. Almost 10 years have elapsed since the treaties were signed, but neither of them has been validated yet owing to Washington's boycott of their ratification.

A debate has been going on in the United States over these treaties for a number of years. However, Washington always finds excuses to thwart their ratification.

On acceding to power, the Reagan administration stated the need to revise the 1974 and 1976 treaties in view of the supposed impossibility of effective monitoring of their observance. It has become clear to everyone now that not only the ending of nuclear weapons tests within a very short time but also accords imposing any limitations whatever on these tests are not to Washington's liking.

The chief reason for Washington's desire to undermine the accords signed at the highest level lies in American imperialism's plans aimed at achieving military superiority over the USSR and accelerating the development of all types of nuclear weapons, above all strategic weapons.

The directives announced by Washington in the sphere of war preparations provide for the production of approximately 17,000 new nuclear charges over the next few years. Addressing the U.S. Congress, E. Rostow, former director of the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, declared: "We will still have to conduct tests for a long time, and perhaps even tests of arms whose yield exceeds the prescribed limit of 150 kilotons." Commentary is superfluous, as they say.

Of course, such an overtly militarist policy by Washington arouses public concern, including in the United States itself. And the present U.S. Administration -- particularly now, during the election campaign -- is resorting to maneuvers of various kinds to camouflage its true intentions of breaking up the existing system of accords in the arms limitation sphere.

This is precisely the view that should be taken of the U.S. proposals that followed in 1983 to hold new talks on revising the provisions of the 1974 and 1976 "threshold" treaties concerning monitoring issues. It was stated that the American side lacks confidence in the provision of sufficiently reliable monitoring of their observance and that some grounds have supposedly arisen to suspect the USSR of violating the accord on not exceeding the 150-kiloton ceiling in nuclear tests. As a result, the United States proposed "improving" the monitoring measures. The Reagan administration was virtually trying to get the existing treaties revised.

In recent years the United States has again been dragging up the monitoring issues in order to wreck not only possible accords but also the very process of negotiations. As soon as the public demands for talks become more persistent or progress in reaching some specific accords becomes apparent, Washington always advances the thesis of the "inadequacy" and "unreliability" of the monitoring measures. At the trilateral talks on a total ban on nuclear weapons tests the American side was constantly complicating the process of preparing the agreement by submitting additional points relating to monitoring. And when the text of the projected treaty, including the majority of monitoring measures, was agreed, the United States unilaterally broke off the talks. The same methods are being used by U.S. representatives now to block the talks on this problem at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

It has repeatedly been confirmed over the past 10 years that the national technical means at the sides' disposal are quite adequate for the purpose of monitoring observance of the 1974 and 1976 treaties. The high efficiency which has now been achieved in equipment for recording seismic signals and in the methods of processing them makes it possible to obtain by national means with a sufficient degree of accuracy assessments of the yield of nuclear charges being tested.

Seeking to secure the sides' agreement when preparing the 1974 treaty, the Soviet Union resorted to a whole number of additional measures to enhance the effectiveness of monitoring. An accord was reached to conduct all nuclear weapon tests only on designated ranges and test sites.

It was proposed, on the exchange of instruments of ratification, to provide each other with information on the characteristics of the rock in the test sites and also to exchange data on nuclear explosions already carried out on each of the test sites -- which would make it possible to determine more accurately the yield of charges in subsequent tests.

The monitoring mechanism elaborated for the 1974 and 1976 treaties, which ensures reliable verification of the fulfillment by both sides of their adopted pledges, is to be introduced after the ratification of the treaties. The reliability of the assessment of the yield of explosions carried out after ratification can be enhanced considerably, and there can be no question of any "ucertainty" in observing the prescribed ceiling.

According to an assertion by Admiral A. Gayler, former director of the U.S. National Security Agency, American scientists have recently made discoveries which make it possible clearly to distinguish seismic waves caused by underground nuclear explosions from waves caused by earthquakes, even in cases when the yield of a nuclear explosion amounts to less than 1 kiloton. This removes the technical obstacles in the way of signing a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. But the Reagan administration stubbornly fails to heed this. It is only interested in seeing that monitoring measures are not put into practice.

One asks oneself why treaties are signed. Apparently so that they should be validated and come into operation. The United States probably has a different opinion on this -- one far removed from a desire to reduce political and military tension in the world.

As for the Soviet Union, its stand on this question is clear. The USSR takes a highly responsible attitude toward signed documents and has always strictly fulfilled and still fulfills its international pledges, including those under the aforementioned accords. Nevertheless, some people in the present U.S. Administration are clearly impatient to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's fulfillment of international agreements. The U.S. Administration is using various fraudulent maneuvers to try to create among the public the opinion that it is not Washington but the Soviet Union that is responsible for the fact that the 1974 and 1976 treaties have not been ratified. Such arguments are not new. Washington long ago made it a rule not to ratify signed treaties on the pretext of monitoring difficulties or for other farfetched reasons, to wreck talks, and to avoid discussing very important problems of arms limitation and reduction. This is done for a very definite purpose -- to prevent the reaching of accords, to worsen Soviet-American relations as a whole, and to continue escalating the nuclear arms race.

The question of the U.S. attitude toward its adopted pledges is acquiring an increasingly serious international nature, since it is, above all, a question of trust, of the fulfillment of treaties and agreements which have been signed by the leaders of a state such as the United States. Washington's stand on the question of observance of its treaty obligations and, in particular, of the "threshold" treaties was assessed by the Soviet Union in a memorandum sent to the American side in January 1984. It states, in particular: "Despite the assurances given that the United States intends to observe the 150-kiloton limitation on yield, the practice of the nuclear charges being tested exceeding [the ceiling] is evidently continuing."

The pose of a prosecutor accusing absolutely everyone, which the United States now strikes when examining questions of limiting arms, will deceive no one. The Soviet Union is no less interested in reliable monitoring than the United States, but is in fact more interested, since it is precisely Washington, frequently acting in circumvention of existing accords, which is developing new nuclear weapons systems which will be increasingly hard to monitor, and it is precisely the United States which is deploying nuclear weapons on the territories of many countries with a view to ensuring that they do not come under any checks.

The course taken by the U.S. Administration of wrecking talks in the sphere of banning nuclear weapon tests, which is covered up by references to the "inadequacy" of monitoring measures, is thoroughly spurious and hypocritical. It elicits sharp criticism from the majority of states. The frivolous U.S. approach to the previously signed 1974 and 1976 treaties, as well as to other international agreements, is gaining it a reputation as an unreliable partner in negotiations. Today an overwhelming number of states are awaiting a solution to the problem of a total ban on nuclear weapon tests. And it is now up to the United States.

PRAVDA EDITORIALIZES ON SOVIET PEACE POLICY

PM201145 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Apr 84 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Loyalty to the Ideals of Peace"]

[Text] Ever since Great October combined the concepts of socialism and peace into an indissoluble whole, the land of the soviets has invariably acted as a counter-force to the imperialist warmongers. Loyalty to the Leninist peace policy, whose main features at the contemporary historical stage have been defined by the decisions of recent party congresses, was reaffirmed in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee April (1984) Plenum and the 1st session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation. This policy meets with ardent approval in our country and among people of goodwill all over the planet. In his speech at the plenum Comrade K.U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted: "With consistency and initiative we are working to defuse tension in world politics, curb the arms race, and reliably ensure the country's security."

The world situation remains highly dangerous. And this is explained by the fact that the U.S. Administration is still gambling on military force, the attainment of military superiority, and the imposition on other peoples of systems which Washington deems suitable. The world has lately seen several examples of this policy. They include the blows against Lebanon, the occupation of Grenada, the undeclared war against Nicaragua, threats to Syria, and, finally, the transformation of West Europe into a launchpad for new U.S. missiles targeted against the USSR and its allies, which has particularly aggravated world tension.

The Soviet Union has been and remains a staunch advocate of halting the dangerous turn of events and reversing the nuclear arms race. A whole range of proposals advanced by it are aimed at this. The Soviet initiatives for an immediate freeze on nuclear arsenals, to limit and substantially reduce strategic weapons, to radically lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe, to prevent the militarization of space, to ban and destroy chemical weapons — these and other Soviet initiatives are dictated by life itself.

The Soviet Union is not infringing the security of anybody at all. The measures it is adopting to strengthen defense are a natural response to the senseless attempts by the militarist circles of the United States and the other NATO countries to disrupt the military-strategic balance. The USSR is not seeking military superiority and does not intend to dictate its will to others. But it will not permit the existing parity to be broken.

The curbing of the nuclear arms race is of key significance for the cause of peace and the peoples' security. The Soviet Union invariably opposes the buildup of nuclear arsenals and advocates the banning and destruction of all types of such weapons. As for the United States -- by deploying its new missiles in West Europe it has deliberately blocked the process of limiting and reducing nuclear weapons and has created obstacles to talks on medium-range and strategic nuclear weapons.

Though peace-loving assurances can sometimes be heard from Washington, it is impossible with the best will in the world to detect any underlying intention to back up the words with practical deeds. Mankind does not need assurances about a readiness for talks but a readiness to remove the obstacles in the path of the talks. As soon as the United States, and the other NATO countries acting in concert with it, take measures to restore the status quo prior to the start of the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in West Europe, a real possibility for resuming talks and seeking mutually acceptable accords will open up.

The Soviet proposal to agree on a code of definite standards to which relations between nuclear powers would be subject is aimed at improving the international climate. It is also important to restore an atmosphere of trust between states. The combination of large-scale steps of a political and international-legal nature with measures of a military-technical nature, which the Soviet Union and the other socialist community advocate, would make it possible to ensure the success of the Stockholm conference and make it a major contribution to strengthening European and international security.

By their vigorous and purposeful actions the countries of the socialist community exert a tremendous influence on the maintenance and strengthening of peace. The strengthening of the Warsaw Pact state's political and defensive alliance and the expansion and deepening of economic cooperation among the CEMA countries will continue to be the prime task of the USSR's foreign policy activity.

One of the foundations of the USSR's foreign policy is solidarity with peoples who have cast off the yoke of colonial dependence and embarked on the path of independent development -- particularly those who are having to repulse the attacks of the aggressive forces of imperialism, which is creating very dangerous centers of bloody violence and armed conflagrations first in one, then in another region of the world. To support the peoples' just cause and advocate the elimination of such centers is a necessary and important salient of the struggle for a lasting peace on earth. The Soviet Union will continue to heed attentively the opinion of the Nonaligned Movement -- an influential peace-loving force.

The Soviet Union confirms the immutability of the line of businesslike and mutually advantageous cooperation with capitalist countries, on the basis, of course, of equality and noninterference in internal affairs and without any discrimination.

The USSR favors the peaceful solution of all international disputes by means of serious, equitable, and constructive talks. It is ready to cooperate with all who sincerely desire to ward off the nuclear threat, who wish to consolidate peace on earth, and who understand the vital need for cooperation for the sake of peace and progress.

Soviet people are responding to the CPSU Central Committee May Day slogans with new labor achievements, which are increasing our socialist motherland's might:

Long live the Soviet Union's peace-loving Leninist foreign policy!

Let us implement the Soviet Peace Program!

NEW TIMES ASSESSES CONFIDENCE-BUILDING FORUMS

PM121340 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 14, Apr 84 pp 5-6

[Anatoliy Alekseyev article: "Recess in Stockholm"]

[Text] At the preparatory meeting in Helsinki for the first stage of the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe it was decided to break it up into a number of sessions. The first of these was held in Stockholm from January 17 to March 16.

This initial session was a highly important phase of the Stockholm forum. Its opening brought together the ministers of foreign affairs of the participating countries who set forth their respective positions. The two months of plenary sittings in the Swedish capital's Kulturhuset were devoted to examination and clarification of the various approaches.

The purpose of the conference, as specified in the terms of reference agreed at the Madrid meeting, is to undertake new, effective and concrete actions designed to make progress in strengthening confidence and security and in achieving disarmament so as to "give effect and expression to the duty of the states to refrain from the threat or use of force in their mutual relations." The first stage is to consider and adopt mutually complementary confidence and security building measures designed to "reduce the risk of military confrontation in Europe."

What do these formulations imply in practical terms? What lines should the conference follow in order to live up to its purpose? The views expressed so far on this score vary widely (the considerations advanced by the neutral and non-aligned countries a week before the adjournment in Stockholm relfect, as they themselves say, only the views of this group of countries and are not a compromise attempt to bridge the gulf between the positions of the NATO and Warsaw Treaty states). This of course was not unexpected. The differences between the policies purused by the participating countries stand out in bold relief in Stockholm, as on the international arena in general.

"Detente has deep roots," Konstantin Chernenko said in his speech at a meeting of voters during the recent election campaign. "One indication of this is the convocation of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Disarmament in Europe." It is in this framework that the Soviet Union views the part the conference has to play in the present situation and its perspectives.

The conference indeed would help to improve the political climate both on the European Continent and in international relations in general. Its immediate task is to help restore and strengthen confidence among the states. This is an urgent need at a time when international confidence has been seriously undermined by the actions of the U.S. and its NATO allies.

The Stockholm forum affords wide opportunities for the countries to display goodwill. All that is needed is to make use of these openings. Convinced that notwithstanding the deterioration of the situation countries with different social and political systems can, if they wish, arrive at mutually acceptable understandings, the Soviet Union has voiced readiness for constructive examination in Stockholm of a wide range of confidence and security building measures.

Together with other countries of the socialist community, the Soviet Union from the very outset exerted efforts to focus attention on the problems on which the strengthening of confidence and security in Europe really depends.

The socialist countries have definitively demonstrated their desire to see the conference proceed along lines leading to success and not be allowed to become just another talk shop concerned with minor issues.

As distinct from their behavior in the recent past, representatives of the NATO countries have been lavish in Stockholm with assurances of the best of intentions. U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz for instance said: "Let us so conduct ourselves in our deliberations that historians of the future will mark this gathering as a turning point in East-West relations." (It might be recalled that for a long time the U.S. did its utmost to prevent the convocation of the conference.)

On the eve of the conference the U.S. began the deployment on the territory of a number of West European countries of its new nuclear missiles and thereby torpedoed the talks on limitation and reduction of nuclear arms. Putting up in Stockholm a pretence of readiness for "an open, comprehensive political dialogue" and the establishment of "a long-term constructive and realistic relationship based on equilibrium moderation and reciprocity" (as the communique of the NATO Council session held in December last year put it) the United States and its allies counted on using the conference to make it appear as if dialogue were continuing without any interruption and to counter with studied optimism the deep anxiety felt by the European peoples.

On January 24 the representatives of Turkey officially submitted to the conference on behalf of the delegations of all the NATO countries a document containing a "package" of proposals. It contained no surprises. Its content had been set forth by the U.S. secretary of state in his opening statement in Stockholm, and had been basically made public even before the conference in various pronouncements and interviews by American official spokesmen. The only noteworthy thing was the haste with which these proposals were submitted as the platform of the entire NATO bloc, without close examination of the viewpoints of the other participating countries. There evidently was a good reason for this.

The U.S. State Department found it necessary to stress specially that the NATO countries' proposals were evidence of a serious approach on the part of the West to the Stockholm conference. Was this really so? Let us take a closer look at these proposals.

The first and obviously most important proposal envisaged the exchange of information on the structure of the land forces and landbased air strength in Europe and at the beginning of each year. The remaining proposals essentially boiled down to prior notification of movements of land forces outside the confines of garrisons and of mobilizations of armed forces, invitation of observers, and conduct of inspections.

All this is nothing but a rehash of the old dubious "transparency" and "arms control without disarmament" theses. Moreover, the framers of the United States and its numerous military bases encircling the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as military activity in the seas adjoining Europe, ocean areas and airspace, although these are specifically mentioned in the mandate of the conference. As a matter of fact, the NATO package as a whole conflicts with the agreed mandate, which specifies that confidence and security building measures are to be based on "equality of rights, balance and reciprocity, equal respect for the security interests of all CSCE participating states."

NATO could not but know that the "transparency" and "arms control without disarmament" concepts had been resolutely rejected by the socialist countries earlier and are no more acceptable now.

What ends would be served by giving the West access to information on the structure and activity of the armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty states at a time when the new U.S. enhanced-precision nuclear missiles are being deployed on their frontiers? After all, the Pershing and cruise missiles are first-strike weapons.

Not long ago the Italian Paese Sera published an open letter from the creator of the cruise missiles, Thomas K. Siemer, to the Italian President and the Pope "I can say with maximum certainty," he wrote, "that the cruise missile is unquestionably an offensive weapons, a frist-strike weapon totally useless if it is not to be used for surprise attack." And the same applies to the Pershings.

Add to this what the American General Bernard Rogers recently told the U.S. House of Representatives Armed Services Committee. The general, incidentally, specially underscored that he was speaking in the capacity of NATO Supreme Commander in Europe and not as a private individual bearing no responsiblity. "A distinctive feature of flexible response is NATO's preparedness to escalate to the first use of nuclear weapons," he said.

Now that the new U.S. nuclear missiles are already being deployed in Western Europe, the general holds that the "most pressing need is the strengthening of conventional forces" (the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe that have been dragging on for ten years now apparently go under another department). The aim is to have the capability to "delay, disrupt and neutralize with conventional weapons the follow-on echelons of Warsaw Pact forces," in other words, to strike at the armed forces of the socialist countries far beyond the line of engagement between the two military-political groups.

Being obsessed with such doctrines, the NATO brass are casting about for openings to ascertain what the socialist countries are doing in the sphere of defense What has this in common with the strengthening of confidence and security?

And can this be called a serious approach? If one-sided proposals known in advance to be unacceptable are laid on the negotiating table, this can only testify to a flippant attitude to talks, the absence of any desire to achieve positive results. One can only conjecture as to the criteria by which U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Burt was guided when he said at a Washington press conference on March 15 that the most important thing that had happened during the first round of the conference was the package proposal on confidence and security building measures put forward by the NATO countries whereas the Soviet Union allegedly had not advanced any official proposals.

The Soviet Union has clearly declared its readiness to join in working out, as a follow-up to the relevant provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, more far-reaching and comprehensive additional measures for strengthening confidence in the military sphere. These measures were enumerated by Andrey Gromyko in his speech in Stockholm.

What is primarily needed in the present situation is determined actions to bring about a turn from confrontation to detente and cooperation to remove the danger of war, to rule out the possibility of armed force, and above all nuclear weapons, being ever resorted to. Major, effective measures reflecting the political will of the states to reduce tension, build mutual trust, and strengthen peace are needed. The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Treaty states have proposed such measures. First, that all nuclear powers attending the Stockholm conference undertake the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Second, that treaty on the mutual renunciation of the use of armed force and on the maintenance of relations of peace be concluded.

Instead of approaching examination of these major measures in a constructive spirit and with a sense of responsibility, the representatives of the NATO countries have concentrated on advancing far-fetched arguments designed to justify evasion of businesslike discussion. And since they are hard put to invent any new arguments, they have been simply repeating the standard excuses.

No small opportunities for creating an atmosphere of confidence and strengthening security are offered by such initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community as the proposals on the non-increase of subsequent reduction of military spending and on ridding Europe of chemical weapons. The NATO countries have been urged to enter into talks on these questions. It is to be hoped that there will be a positive response.

The question of the creation of non-nuclear zones in various parts of Europe, as suggested by a number of European countries, is directly linked with the scaling down of the war danger and the strengthening of confidence. It would be a good thing if the conference paid serious attention to this question.

The Stockholm conference is to resume deliberations on May 8. It is essential to use the recess for serious thought, so that historians of the future should not describe the Stockholm forum as a conference of lost opportunities.

WARSAW PACT FOREIGN MINISTERS' COMMUNIQUE

LD201624 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 20 Apr 84

["Communique of Meeting of Warsaw Treaty Foreign Ministers' Committee" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS -- The Committee of the Foreign Affairs Ministers from the member states of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance held its regular meeting in Budapest on April 19-20, 1984.

The meeting was attended by: Foreign Affairs Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov; Foreign Affairs Minister of the Hungarian People's Republic Peter Varkonyi; Foreign Affairs Minister of the German Democratic Republic Oskar Fischer; Foreign Affairs Minister of the Polish People's Republic Stefan Olszowski; Foreign Affairs Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania Stefan Andrei; First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Foreign Affairs Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Andrey Gromyko; Foreign Affairs Minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Bohuslav Chnoupek.

1. The ministers thoroughly examined issues related to the situation in Europe in a broader context of the overall international situation.

It was stated that the assessments and conclusions with regard to the dangerous development of this situation, contained in the Prague Political Declaration of January 5, 1983 and the Moscow Joint Statement of June 28, 1983, are fully confirmed by the course of events in recent time. The already tense situation has become even more acute due to the started deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in some NATO countries, which has launched another, particularly dangerous phase in the race of nuclear [words indistinct] the European Continent. This has compelled the Soviet Union to adopt a number of response measures. Talks on nuclear armaments in Europe have been terminated.

[A TASS version of this report, broadcast by Moscow International Service in Russian on 20 April at 1820 GMT, renders "terminated" as "discontinued" -- prekrashcheny]

As a result of the ongoing escalation of the nuclear weapons race, which is consistently opposed by the Warsaw Treaty member states, the threat of nuclear war with its catastrophic consequences to humankind, to very life on earth has sharply increased. Serious damage is inflicted upon European security, trust in relations between states has been undermined.

A source of concern are the concepts dangerous to the cause of peace that are put forward, the concepts that dispute the existing borders between the European states, are spearheaded against their social system and other territorial-political realities, which shaped in Europe. [sentence as received] Relations between states are also complicated by the introduction of discriminatory measures into economic relations, attempts at interfering from the outside in the internal affairs of states.

The increasingly dangerous developments in the European Continent and all over the world are a source of growing alarm among wide sections of the population, which manifests itself in mass anti-war actions and movements, as well as among political figures, scientists and physicians. They demand to end the arms race and to start disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, cooperation between states in the interests of peace and stability, a return to the policy of international detente. Leading statesmen in various countries declare against the policy of confrontation, against the course for building up the arms race, for curbing the arms race.

The peoples of Europe and the whole world denounce the imperialist policy and demand that relations between states be based on respect for independence and sovereignty, non-use of force or threat of force, inviolability of borders, territorial integrity, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, equality and other fundamental principles of inter-state relations.

[The TASS report in Russian renders the above as: . . . imperialist policy and are making efforts to ensure that relations between . . .]

2. Conviction of the Warsaw Treaty member states was stressed at the meeting that improvement of the situation, return to detente require a dialogue between states on fundamental issues of preserving and strengthening peace -- a serious and equal dialogue permeated with a sense of responsibility.

In so doing, the participants in the meeting expressed firm conviction that there are no issues that could not be resolved through talks, if they are conducted on the basis of a constructive approach and political will to attain positive results, with due regard for the vital interests of the peoples, the interests of peace and international security. This is also confirmed by the experience of international relations.

[The TASS report in Russian renders "due regard" as "full regard".]

The states represented at the meeting are ready to conduct such talks on all issues of ensuring peace in Europe which are of common interest.

These talks should have the aim of reaching agreements based on the principle of equality and equal security.

As was repeatedly declared by the Warsaw Treaty member states, they do not seek to ensure military superiority and will not permit military superiority over themselves. They are resolutely in favour of ensuring an equilibrium of forces at the lowest level.

The TASS report in Russian renders ". . . ensure military superiority . . ." as " . . . achieve military superiority and will . . . "]

3. The Warsaw Treaty member states proceed from the premise that questions related to eliminating the threat of nuclear war, a quest of practical ways for putting an end to the arms race and going over to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, should occupy the most important place in the present-day political dialogue.

They do not consider the present course of events to be irreversible and stress that the question of a reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe, both of medium-range and of tactical ones, down to their complete elimination, can be resolved through constructive and productive talks.

An urgent requirement for peace and security in Europe under the present conditions is to put an end to the stockpiling of new nuclear weapons in the continent. In this connection the states represented at the meeting insist that an end be put to the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe, and declare, that should such measures leading to the withdrawal of the missiles already deployed be taken, steps will be simultaneously taken to cancel the counter-measures. This will lay the groundwork for the resumption of talks for reaching appropriate agreements on freeing Europe from nuclear weapons both of medium range and tactical ones. Not a single opportunity, not a single chance should be missed for a return to the path of talks.

The meeting's participants pointed at the same time to the great responsibility of the states on whose territory the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles has started or is being planned, responsibility for the fate of their own and all European peoples, for European and universal peace. It is necessary that precisely these states immediately undertake steps which would ensure the termination of the stationing of medium-range nuclear missiles of their territories and removal of these missiles.

Since the accumulation of nuclear armaments in Europe affects the interests of life and the existence of all European peoples, the states represented at the meeting deem it exceptionally important that all states in Europe consistently work for averting the nuclear war menace and actively facilitate the attainment of this objective. The road to nuclear war in Europe must be blocked, and all European states should make their contribution to this, in one form or another.

In this connection, the Warsaw Treaty member states address a special appeal to the NATO member states, calling them for cooperation in the interests of terminating the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles and withdrawing those already placed, and realizing nuclear disarmament measures in Europe.

4. Proceeding from the fact that the termination of the arms race and transition to disarmament, especially in the nuclear sphere, constitute a vital issue of our time, the states represented at the meeting declare their invariable readiness for talks on a broad range of the urgent issues of restraining the arms race and reducing armaments.

In this context, the meeting's participants deem it necessary to draw attention once again to the proposal set forth in the Prague political declaration of January 5, 1983, to conclude a treaty on non-use of military force and on maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Treaty member states and the member states of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The TASS report in Russian renders the above as:...conclude a treaty on mutual non-use of military force...: adding "mutual"]

They also recall the latest appeals of their states to the NATO member states with regard to direct talks on the question of ridding Europe of chemical weapons and on the issue of non-increase and on reduction of military spending.

The states represented at the meeting are prepared to start at any time a preliminary discussion with the NATO member states of the questions related to the preparation and holding of the talks on all these proposals. They expect from the NATO member states positive and possibly swift reaction to these appeals. [The TASS report in Russian renders the above as:...member states positive and soonest possible reaction to these...]

They stress the urgent need for the nuclear powers to assume, if they have not as yet done so, a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. They favour the earliest beginning of businesslike discussion and solution of such key issues as general and complete probibition of nuclear weapons tests; qualitative and quantitative freeze of nuclear armaments; prohibition of the militarization of outer space, use of force in space and from space against the earth; prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons on a global scale. All the proposals and initiatives by the Warsaw Treaty member states on this score, which they have advanced jointly and individually, remain in force.

The NATO countries' positive response to these proposals would constitute a concrete manifestation of their interest in achieving constructive relations, which is stated in their Brussels declaration of December 9, 1983.

The meeting reiterated the readiness of the states represented at it to study closely and in a positive spirit the proposals of other countries aimed at lessening and removing the threat of nuclear war, ending the arms race, promoting disarmament and strengthening international security, and to exchange opinion on these proposals with all the interested countries.

Reviewing the situation at the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, the participants in the meeting again drew attention to a new approach proposed by the socialist countries directly participating in the talks, according to which lack of agreement on the present-day strength of troops would not hamper accord on their reduction.

If this approach is given due consideration and if all the participants in the talks make efforts, agreement on a substantial reduction in the armed forces and armaments in Central Europe can and must be reached without further delay. The achievement of such an agreement in the present circumstances could have an auspicious effect on the situation in Europe and on prospects for advance towards curbing the arms race and a move towards disarmament.

Considering the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones to be a substantial step towards ridding Europe of nuclear weapons and building trust, the participants in the meeting reiterated the invariable position of their states in favour of the establishment of such zones in the Balkans, in the north of Europe and in other parts of the continent. They energetically support efforts made in this direction.

The meeting expressed the conviction that agreements of importance to international security can be reached at the disarmament conference in Geneva if all the participants perseveringly and purposefully contribute towards it.

5. Much importance was attached at the meeting to the proceedings of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. It was noted with satisfaction that the opening of the conference, to the convocation of which the Warsaw Treaty countries had made their tangible contribution, had taken place, in accordance with its significance, at an appropriate political level.

It was noted furthermore that exchange of opinion had been initiated at the first session of the Stockholm conference on the substance of the tasks on the accomplishment of which its work should be concentrated and that proposals and initiatives had been formulated. It is now important for all the participants in the conference to make efforts to deepen mutual understanding on those tasks and to conduct talks on concrete issues with a view to achieving effective results. It takes political will and this kind of mutual understanding for talks to be as productive as possible.

The states represented at the meeting believe that mutually complementing confidence and securing building measures should be worked out at the conference to meet the acutest and most pressing needs of today's Europe and to aim at lessening the threat of war and scaling down armed confrontation. Guiding themselves by these goals, they will continue during the proceedings of the Stockholm confernce and at the talks within its framework to contribute towards achieving agreements on such measures.

They also stand for the conference proceeding, upon the completion of its work on confidence and security building measures and in accordance with the provisions of the final document of the Madrid meeting, without any delay to consideration of disarmament measures in Europe.

6. The participants in the meeting stressed the immutability of the principled course of their states at eliminating the existing centres of tension and armed conflicts all over the world and at preventing the emergence of new ones, and at settling all the international disputes by peaceful means, through talks. They reiterated their solidarity with the peoples fighting for freedom, independence and social progress, for economic development and against the policy of imperialist aggression, colonialism and racism.

XXX

The meeting of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries passed in an atmosphere of comradely mutual understanding and a desire to contribute towards a turn for the better in the development of international events.

The next meeting of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries will take place in Berlin in November 1984.

Varkonyi Comments

LD212047 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 21 Apr 84

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Oleg Bolinov]

[Text] The loyalty of socialist countries to the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems was again confirmed at the regular meeting in Budapest of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of Warsaw Pact countries. After the end of the meeting our correspondent Yuriy Rogov asked Comrade Varkonyi, the Hungarian foreign minister, to sum up the results of the meeting:

[Begin recording of Varkonyi in Hungarian with superimposed Russian translation] It has been a great honor for us for this tenth and anniversary meeting to be held in Budapest. We met together and discussed our common affairs at a moment of exacerbation of the international situation throughout the whole world, especially in Europe. Naturally, we analyzed the reasons for this situation. The reason for it is above all that the deployment of American nuclear missiles has started in certain Western European countries.

We concentrated our efforts on a search for possibilities and means to direct the dangerous course of international events into a favorable channel. We proceeded from the task of removing the threat of a world nuclear war, returning the course of events to the path of normal interstate relations, and implementing the principles of peaceful coexistence.

In a comradely and friendly atmosphere we carefully analyzed the initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, individually and jointly with all the Warsaw Pact member states. We drew up new proposals directed at removing the dangerous processes that have arisen as a result of the intrigues of U.S. and NATO imperialist circles. Sharing the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state, we advocate the cessation of the new stage of the arms race and the preservation of the relative military balance at the lowest possible level of armaments.

Summing up the results, I consider that the meeting of the Foreign Minister's Committee, this important political body of the Warsaw Pact, has accomplished useful work, and my counterparts are returning to their countries with satisfaction over the common action program that has been adopted and with a striving to continue the struggle for peace and the people's security, Comrade Peter Varkonyi, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the Hungarian People's Republic, said in conclusion. [end recording]

Kornilov Commentary

LD211355 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS - TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

There is hardly any important problem connected with the consolidation of peace on which countries of the socialist community would not make concrete and realistic proposals in the past several years. The consistent orientation of socialist foreign policy and socialist diplomacy on the preservation and consolidation of peace, on ensuring a reliable security for peoples, was reaffirmed once again at the session of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Warsaw Treaty member states held in Budapest on April 19-20.

The curbing of the nuclear arms race is of key importance for peace and security of nations. The stand of socialist countries on this problem is clear. The Warsaw Treaty member states resolutely oppose the competition in the nuclear arms buildup. They have been and continue to be the consistent supporters of the banning and elimination of all the types of nuclear weapons. The countries that participated in the Budapest session stressed in the communique their invariable readiness to hold talks on a wide range of burning problems connected with the arms race and the reduction of armaments.

According to the communique, the socialist countries are absolutely confident that there are no such problems that could not be solved by means of negotiations if they are held on the basis of constructive approach and political will for achieving positive results, with full account for the vital interests of peoples, the interest of peace and international security.

This fully refers to such an extremely important problem as the reduction of nuclear armaments in Europe. The Warsaw Treaty member states, true to their policy of peace, insist on the termination of the deployment in Western Europe of American medium-range nuclear missiles and stress that if the measures are taken to withdraw the already deployed missiles, they will be immediately reciprocated by the steps to cancel the reply measures. This would create a basis for the resumption of talks with the aim to achieve corresponding agreements on the removal from Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical ones. Not a single chance should be missed for getting back to the path of negotiations.

The constructive peace proposals of the socialist states have been hailed by all those who cherish peace and international security. And who is it that has found them unsuitable? Who is it that has stubbornly refused to sign a treaty on the mutual renunciation of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO? It is the United States that sticks to this negative stand. Who is it that continues a crash effort to deploy first-strike weapons in Europe, making its western part into a nuclear hostage of the Pentagon? It the United States again. Who is it that, while readily talking about its "commitment to peace" and its "thirst for dialogue", in fact either blocks any disucssion on disarmament problems or forces it into pre-programmed dead ends and continues to speed up the military conveyers, threatening the world with missiles, nuclear bombs, chemical arms and other weapons? It is the self-same Reagan administration nursing boundless hegemonist ambitions.

It was stressed at the Budapest forum, which passes in an atmosphere of comradely mutual understanding and was keynoted by the attending countries' desire to achieve a change for the better in international affairs, that the Warsaw Treaty member states neither seek military superiority nor will allow such superiority over themselves. They determinedly press for insuring the balance of forces at the lowest level. It is essential to look for, and find, practical ways of ending the arms race and starting disarmament, especially that in the nuclear field. The USSR and its friends and allies are prepared for this. The onus now lies with the West.

Olenichev on Meeting

LD211456 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] The Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, consisting of seven countries -- Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia -- has held a meeting in Budapest. Viktor Olenichev provides the following details. This is what he writes:

The focal point of the meeting was the situation in Europe. That situation has sharply aggravated in recent time and now influences the entire march of developments in the world. That happened because the United States began deploying its new medium-range missiles in certain NATO countries. As a result, a new and more dangerous round of the arms race was launched. In short, there is a danger that Europe will become once again a hotbed of world conflict. This time, however, this conflict would have catastrophic consequences for mankind, for everything living on earth.

It's hardly surprising that millions of people are now voicing their increasing alarm with the march of events on the European Continent. This is evidenced in the mounting antiwar movement, in statements by politicians, scientists, and physicians. The socialist countries share in full these feelings of concern expressed by the world public. They believe at the same time that the present-day situation can be reversed. They are certain now as before that there are no such questions that cannot be settled through negotiations. The experience of international relations confirms this.

The imminent need for such an earnest, equitable, and responsible dialogue was emphasized in Budapest. This dialogue must help remove the threat of nuclear war. To achieve that, the stockpiling of new nuclear means in Europe must be halted first and foremost. The Warsaw Treaty countries therefore insist that the deployment of new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe be stopped. Should steps be taken to restore the situation prior to the deployment of new American missiles in Europe, there will be no need for the socialist countries to take countermeasures. The way will be paved for a resumption of talks over making the continent free from nuclear arms, both medium-range and tactical.

The participants in the meeting in Budapest called attention once again to the importance of the proposal by the Warsaw Treaty countries for signing an agreement with the NATO countries on the mutual non-use of military force. In their opinion, it would be an essential factor in favor of peace if nuclear powers decided to take upon themselves a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear arms. The Soviet Union has already assumed a commitment upon itself.

The communique issued at the end of the meeting states that the socialist countries are ready to consider any proposals aimed at removing the nuclear threat. The meeting in Budapest reaffirmed the consistency of the policy of the socialist countries and their desire to work to bring about a turn for the better in international relations. The ideal of the socialist countries is peace without wars.

Levin Commentary

LD221008 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 22 Apr 84

[Text] The foreign news media are analyzing the communique on the session of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact member-states. Many reports stress that the countries of the socialist community have reaffirmed their willingness to engage in a constructive dialogue with the West. A Mayak commentary. At the microphone, Viktor Levin:

At their session in Budapest, the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact member-states noted that the international situation remains very difficult. With the deployment in some of the NATO countries of American medium-range missiles, an already tense situation has become more acute. But even in extraordinarily difficult circumstances, the socialist states consistently and persistently urge that the situation be improved through dialogue, and a return to dente made possible. The document adopted at the Budapest session underlines that there are no questions that could not be resolved through negotiations if they are conducted on the basis of a constructive approach and a political will to achieve positive results, taking into account fully the vital interests of the peoples and the interests of peace and international security.

In calling on the West to join in such a dialogue, the socialist countries emphasize that it must not be a conversation for the sake of conversation. In the Western countries at present, there is a lot of talk about dialogue -- so much that it is becoming tedious. Even in Washington. But, when put to the test, all these arguments about the desirability of talks turn out to be a cover-up for imperialist policy. The concrete actions of the American Administration leave no doubt that the course towards achieving military superiority over the countries of socialism, the course of gross interference in the affairs of other nations for the purpose of imposing America's will on them, is not only not being refined, but is being put into practice more and more intensively.

In raising the question of a constructive dialogue, the Warsaw Pact member-states stress that the aim of talks must be to reach agreements based upon the principles of parity and equal security. Given goodwill -- and the socialist countries have plenty of that -- we can even find a way out of those situations which the United States has been responsible for deadlocking. This applies, first and foremost, to the problem of stopping the stockpiling of new nuclear weapons in Europe. In this connection, the Budapest communique notes, the socialist states insist that an end must be put to the deployment of American medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe, and declare that if measures are taken that will lead to the withdrawal of the missile that have already been deployed, then steps will be taken at the same time to cancel the retaliatory measures. This will create a basis for resuming the talks with the aim of achieving appropriate agreements in ridding Europe of nuclear weapons.

No opportunity, no chance of a return to the path of negotiation must be missed. That call pervades the whole of the communique on the session of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Pact.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD221336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 22 Apr 84

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, editor in chief of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator; and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio]

Warsaw Pact Communique; CW Ban

[Text] [Tsvetov] Hello there, comrades. Today, the Soviet people and the working people of the whole world are marking the 114th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilich Lenin. A major place in the multifacted theoretical and practical activity of Vladimir Ilich was held by the elaboration of questions related to the foreign policy of the land of the soviets. What is the main implication of Lenin's directives for the policies of the Soviet Union today? Naturally, that -- together with the other socialist countries -- it must guarantee favorable conditions for socialist and communist construction. Let me remind you that in 1918 Lenin predicted the principal features of future relations among the socialist countries -- that is, relations of socialist internationalism. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee decision on the annulment of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty, signed by Lenin, said that -- and I quote -- only those principles which accord with fraternal relations among the working people of all countries and nations can form the basis of these relations. This will be an alliance of the working masses of all nations, continued the All-Russian Central Executive Committee decision, in their struggle for the creation and strengthening of the socialist system on the ruins of the system of militarism, imperialism and economic servitude. As Lenin foresaw, socialist internationalism made possible the formation of a genuinely fraternal alliance of the socialist countries. It is personified in the Warsaw Pact Organization and the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. The concerted actions of the socialist countries in the international arena have made possible the performance of many major and complex tasks, and this has contributed to the creation of favorable international conditions for socialist and communist construction. Well, for instance, let me recall the foiling of the imperialist blockage of Cuba, let me recall the victory of the Vietnamese people over the American aggressors, let me recall the successful holding of the All European Conference on Security and Cooperation and the attainment of a number of international agreements on limiting the arms race.

A session of the committee of foreign ministers of the participant-states of the Warsaw Pact has just been held in Budapest. A communique adopted by those taking part in the session of the committee contains a truly all-embracing list of peace initiatives, the realization of which would make peace on earth -- not just in Europe but throughout the world -- stable and everlasting. Let me just mention the pressing call of the socialist countries for a halt to the deployment of American nuclear missiles in West Europe and for the adoption of measures to withdraw those which have already been deployed. This would make it possible for talks to begin on the reduction in Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons to a point where they are fully removed. The communique contains comprehensive proposals for reducing the danger of the occurrence of nuclear war, for ridding Europe of chemical weapons, for reducing armed forces and armaments in central Europe and for the establishment of nuclear-free zones. All these are concerted actions, a concrete expression of socialist internationalism as Vladimir Ilich Lenin understood it.

Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR minister of foreign affairs, said in Budapest that the Soviet Union, along with the other socialist countries, is categorically against the dishonest game which the United States is playing over the issue of banning chemical weapons. If one discards the verbal framework, Comrade Gromyko said, then it will be discovered that the United States is only concerned with retaining this type of weapon on its side and increasing its stocks. The latest episode in this dishonest game was put on in Geneva last week by Bush, the American vice president.

[Gerasimov] Bush's trip to Geneva was preceded by much advance publicity. Bush spoke about something new in the area of disarmament, some new initiative. Well, let us take a closer look at what it boils down to. What is involved is not so much a ban on chemical weapons, but the need for verification of the observance of an agreement on a chemical weapons ban. None, of course, is against verification itself, the very idea of verification, and, incidentally, the Soviet side has always stressed that it also needs verification of the observance of an agreement on the part of the other side. But let us take a close look at what Bush is proposing. He says that this verification must apply to government installations and to installations controlled by the government alike. [as received] But what will happen then with American enterprises which are in private hands? Here you have one specific example of the flaws in the American proposals, which, by the way, Bush himself admitted at his press conference. In any case, generally speaking, the issue is not the problem of control. The issue is that the United States behaves in a manner which does not suggest willingness for a ban on chemical weapons. The administration is seeking from Congress allocations to increase the arsenal of chemicals by adding the so-called binary poisonous substances. The following argument is put forward: There should be plenty of chemical weapons available to make their banning and destruction worthwhile. Also it is well known that for a very long time the United States showed complete indifference to this problem. The United States joined in the 1925 Geneva protocol on banning chemical weapons only after a long delay. In effect the United States was sabotaging the talks which were already being held on this problem. From all this we may conclude that the present initiative which is being very widely publicised by the Western media is not derived from a desire to ban the dreadful chemical weapons but is rather dictated by quite specific political motives. Reagan is to run for the Presidency. He feels that the U.S. electorate would not like to have a president who would endanger the country by his bellicosity. Therefore, Reagan has figured out that he needs peaceful initiatives of some sort. Hence the statement made by Bush in Geneva about this U.S. draft -- it falls most readily in that category.

[Tsvetov] Then there was this coincidence -- but a most symptomatic one -- just a few days ago a Danish fishing vessel was blown up by a World War II mine filled with a poisonous substance, and several fishermen died. In this way it would seem we are getting a warning from out of the past about just how dangerous chemical weapons are, and how important it really is to have it banned; and also how vile the U.S. efforts seem to slow down this process and to prevent if from developing.

[Gerasimov] I would add also that chemical weapons cause the Europeans great concern. Indeed the Europeans were the first to experience themselves -- back in World War I -- what these weapons mean. The U.S. chemical weapons are not intended for America, not for use on American -- their own American -- territory. These weapons are, in a manner of speaking, produced for export. They are meant to be used on the so-called European theater of war. And it is in this theater that the United States is now installing its new nuclear missiles; in this theater clearly the United States intends in time to deliver chemical weapons.

And the Europeans have yet another cause for concern -- although this is not under specific discussion at present -- concerning the United States plans for antimissile defense. Caspar Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, made a tour of Europe not long ago trying to persuade the Europeans that the antimissile defenses to be created would cover them too, as it were. But concern in West Europe is growing on this count, too -- caused by the Reagan's administration's final refusal to hold talks with the USSR over the demilitarization of outer space.

As you may remember, in March of last year, Reagan gave scientists the task of creating anti-missile defenses. And not long ago Weinberger, the defense secretary, reiterated that such defenses were technically capable of covering Europe, too. This is complete deception. Effective anti-missile defenses are an impossibility even for the United States itself. This is a view held by scientists and experts in America, as well as the view of Soviet scientists. Therefore the fears of West Europeans, of the inhabitants of West European countries, are quite understandable.

[Tsvetov] For this reason public opinion in Europe expects the Stockholm Conference on Measures for Security and Cooperation in Europe to reduce the military confrontation. But the United States and some of its allies want to divert the conference from this main task. Gennadiy Ivanovich, you just returned from Stockholm. What is the mood there?

Nuclear-Free Zones

[Gerasimov] I would say the mood in Stockholm is one of guarded optimism. This is true in the sense that many are saying the convening of the Stockholm conference in itself -- it is in recess right now but will resume on 8 May for its second session, the conference is very long, it is to take a few years -- the fact itself of the Stockholm meeting between the West and the East, against the background of the present very complicated and dangerous international situation, is welcome, and must be welcomed. The conference is seen by many, I repeat, as a symbol of hope. This is the expression used by Olof Palme, the Swedish prime minister. However, the West is trying to lead the conference away from its main task -- which is to ensure a real atmosphere of trust in Europe.

[Tsvetov] The mass news media in the West are accusing the Soviet Union of supposedly not yet having put forward anything concrete at this conference to create an atmosphere of trust on the continent.

[Gerasimov] But this does not correspond to reality, of course, because we have put forward measures to strengthen trust. Unfortunately, the United States and countries in the West want problems of a technical nature to be discussed at this conference and are refusing to discuss measures which would really lead to an increase in trust in Europe.

[Sobolev] For example, the mutual pledge not to use nuclear weapons.

[Tsvetov] The creation of nuclear-free zones.

[Sobolev] The non-first-use of nuclear weapons.

[Gerasimov] I can give the following example. As many know, Sweden favors a nuclear-free-zone in Northern Europe, but the United States is against it. Sweden has proposed the creation of a non-nuclear corridor in Central Europe. We, incidentally, supported this proposal, and even said that this zone should be larger, if one proceeds from technical characteristics of modern tactical nuclear weapons. But the United States is against this.

[Sobolev] Meantime, the idea of a nuclear-free-zone is completely feasible. It is practically applicable and there are examples of this. First, on a small scale, so to speak, non-nuclear zones exist throughout the world. In Britain, more than 150 areas of local authority, including London, have declared themselves free of nuclear weapons. In the FRG this decision has been taken by three tenths of district and city councils. In little Belgium the number of non-nuclear municipalities and local areas has exceeded 250. Even in the United States there are 25 non-nuclear cities. Moreover, even in terms of area these are quite sizeable sections, as for example, the non-nuclear district of Beja in Portugal which consists of more than a tenth of the country's territory.

An air base is located there at which the United States would like to deploy nuclear weapons, so the Portuguese declared their district non-nuclear at a very good time. Non-nuclear zones occupy the major part of the Western Hemisphere on a truly large scale. The overwhelming majority of Latin American countries have signed a treaty banning nuclear weapons in Latin America, the Tlatelolco Treaty, named after the area of Mexico City where Mexico's Ministry of Foreign Affairs is located. The signing of the treaty took place there in 1967. It forbids the signatories from testing, using, producing, acquiring, receiving, keeping, or installing nuclear weapons and any form of ownership. In some respects this treaty may not be perfect. Let us say that the United States did its best so that the treaty did not mention transit movement of nuclear weapons. The fact is, I suppose, that the Pentagon assigns great strategic significance to Latin America in the event of a war. U.S. strategists hope to use Latin American armies for auxilliary functions, and to use the continent's territory to move forces and equipment from the Atlantic theater of war to the Pacific Ocean and back. This is why they needed transit facilities. As a whole, of course, the treaty has not overjoyed Washington figures, but the firm will of the Latin American people was demonstrated and the treaty was signed. But what is very important is the fact that there is a protocol attached to the treaty which places upon the nuclear powers that signed it the obligation of observing the nuclear-free status of Latin America. This protocol was signed by all the nuclear powers, that is, the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France and China. In a word, we have before us a fruitful example of the implementation of the idea of nuclear-free zones put forward by our country as far back as the 1950's. What is needed now is to spread these small and large nuclear-free zones to all the land and sea areas of our planet, that is, to put an end to nuclear weapons altogether.

[Tsvetov] European peoples, propelled by just such an aim, are thereby increasing the struggle against the adventuristic policy of the U.S. Government. The press has given out data from public opinion polls carried out in Italy, Britain and West Germany, where as is known, the deployment of new American nuclear missiles has already begun. I will cite a few figures: 83 percent of the Italians asked said no to the deployment of American nuclear weapons on their soil. In Britain 52 percent of those involved in the poll are against the deployment of American nuclear weapons in their country. In West Germany 75 percent of those asked were against the presence of American Pershings and cruise missiles in their country. The anti-nuclear movement in Western Europe has entered a new phase.

[Gerasimov] And now, with the beginning of spring, it can be said that a new upsurge in the antiwar movement is also beginning in the West. Five-day spring marches will take place in West Germany. At this point, I would also make the following point about the responsibility of leaders for the fate of mankind.

We stress that the powers that possess nuclear weapons carry special responsibility for preserving peace. We think that reason should prevail. We are doing everything in order that reason may prevail. Ours is the standpoint of historical optimism. But here is a curious fact: Not long ago a journalist published a report on his research into Reagan's statements. The journalist found five statements made over a period of 4 years in which President Reagan says that in his view it might be that our generation may have to witness the end of the world -- doomsday. This of course cannot but cause concern. Well, we might say that on the one hand man can believe in all sorts of things. It is up to his conscience, so to speak. But on the other hand beliefs can affect human actions, and if that person has his finger on the nuclear button, then this cannot but cause concern among the public.

[Tsvetov] If in the United States there are thoughts of Armageddon and doomsday, the USSR on the other hand is thinking and making every effort toward freeing mankind as soon as possible from the danger of this dommsday, that is, toward freeing mankind from the threat of nuclear war. This is the objective of the proposal made by Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko to make relations among nuclear powers subject to special behavior norms. Regrettably, to this day, the United States has not responded to this proposal, although these proposals, as is well known, have met with wide response around the world, including Western Europe. Only recently, Schlesinger, the former U.S. secretary of defense, wrote an article in the British THE TIMES which begins as follows: Trans-atlantic relations today are characterized by an atmosphere of bitterness and doubt. The article deals with the relations between the United States and Western Europe. The Americans' grave mistakes, the article says further, create concern and discontent in Europe.

The European countries, the former U.S. defense secretary goes on to say, do not intend to put up with encroachments on the gains of detente in Europe. This is a view from the American side. And here is what is being said on the European side of the Atlantic.

I have before me here an issue of the West German STERN magazine, from which I quote: NATO has not brought reunification for the Germans, but it has brought about the Cold War and their subjugation to U.S. military strategy, the aggressive nature of which is no longer being concealed. Well, one probably should not exaggerate the acuteness of discord between Western Europe and the United States, but the symptoms of friction are most significant.

[Gerasimov] It seems to me that in Europe now there is a feeling that the worsening of Soviet-American relations influences the situation in the whole of Europe as well as the international relations of certain European countries. For example, at a meeting (Bernard Carlson), special envoy of the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said that Sweden feels the consequences of worsened Soviet-American relations and the absence of Soviet-American dialogue, and that this sort of atmosphere has a negative effect on Sweden. I think that representatives of the other West European countries would go along with this view. As for Sweden itself, the government stresses its determination to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union. It is well known that Sweden is also in favor of a nuclear arsenals freeze, for a nuclear weapons test ban, for a halt to the arms race in space, for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, of which we have spoken about, and so on. The United States on the other hand is against all these points. Europe is Europe, but the United States is also giving increasing attention to the Pacific region. Reagan, incidentally, is preparing for a trip to the PRC, and in conversation with Chinese journalists recently stated that the Pacific region is the future of the world, since it is the fastest growing region.

U.S.' Pacific Orientation

[Tsvetov] But the cause for increased U.S. interest in the Pacific would seem to be not only, and not even primarily, the U.S. desire to demonstrate in this way displeasure at Western Europe which is beginning to show signs of some disagreement with American policy. There is, rather, considerable significance in the changes that have taken place in the structure of U.S. economic development. I think the main cause here is in the increased economic role of the American states along the Pacific. Powerful production sectors have emerged here: Aviation and cosmonautics, electrical engineering, radio electronics, instrument-building. Large-scale agricultural production has been created here. It is interesting to note that the share of the Pacific states in the U.S. foreign trade balance now exceeds 20 percent. Naturally, this enormous flood of goods is being directed toward the countries of the Pacific and East Asia.

[Gerasimov] Of course this is all correct, but I think that the United States, obsessed with its anti-Sovietism, with the attempt to surround the Soviet Union somehow, has under the present administration now turned more attention to strengthening the so-called Pacific front, against us. Perhaps that is also one of the reasons.

[Tsvetov] But the fact is that the Pacific states are the main source of present American bellicosity. It is from here that Reagan's policy from a position of strength is particularly encouraged insofar as American trade positions in the Pacific and Eastern Asia have now been seriously shaken by Japanese competition -- and even by South Korea and Australia regarding individual goods -- then naturally entrepreneurs of Pacific states cannot come to terms with this, and they push the administration into taking some kind of political and diplomatic steps in that area. This is why Reagan is going to East Asia, and following Reagan at almost the same time are Secretary of State Shultz, Defense Secretary Weinberger, and Vice President Bush. In addition, when 4 years ago Reagan waged the battle for the presidency, the Republican platform set down the aim of creating American strategic superiority over the USSR in Eastern Asia, too. Therefore, the United States is increasing the numbers of its Armed Forces in South Korea, Japan, Guam and Midway, and the Philippines. For this reason the United States is expanding military bases in the Pacific Ocean and in Eastern Asia, and for this reason it wants to spread its nuclear weapons not only to South Korea, Guam, and Midway, but also to Japan. Attempts are being made to create new blocs, one of them with the participation of Washington, Seoul and Tokyo, and the second with the participation of the United States, Canada, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. Thus it seems to me that not only because of elements of West European obstinacy is the United States increasing its attention on the Pacific Ocean and Eastern Asia, but also because the most reactionary circles in the United States are striving to create a new hotbed of international tension here, to turn this region into a place of confrontation with the Soviet Union.

[Sobolev] In talking about President Reagan's policy, I would like to add the following: The world press usually writes about the President that his actions are unpredictable. That is true about Reagan, but it is also true that there is a general current of anti-communist ideology in the President's actions, and on a number of political problems he and his aides have if not a theory, then some kind of system of views.

Central America

[Tsvetov] I would say not so much anti-communist ideology as anti-communist obsession.

[Gerasimov] The President, speaking in the White House, said -- I quote: If Central America is lost then our own borders will be threatened. But what does the word lost mean as far as the President is concerned? Central America is not a thing, a piece of property. It belongs neither to Reagan nor the United States. Washington cannot lose Central America if only because Central America does not belong to the United States. If Washington considers Latin America to be its private domain then that is pure imperialism.

[Sobolev] And those countries which, as you have mentioned, Reagan does not want to lose, are being punished first and foremost by his plans to ruin them. Let us say with regard to Latin America -- this is a system set out in the so-called Santa Fe document, named after a small town where learned anti-communists composed something like a code for the struggle against left-wing forces in the Western Hemisphere. Many of those men have been made important officials by the present U.S. President. The special representative of the President in Central America, Shlaudeman, is known for his work in Chile in the years of the Government of National Unity. He led the preparations for a fascist coup.

At that time the American method was the same -- to make living conditions as bad as possible for the people of Chile. Landowners drove cattle into Argentina and withheld goods, industrialists cut back on capital investment in production, and apart from that, the well-known large-scale sabotage was organized by truck owners.

[Gerasimov] Well, Kissinger said at that time that the Chilean economy must be made to wail.

[Sobolev] And for his former successes, in practice and in theory, Shlaudeman, as we see, became close to the President, and he was given a new field of action in counter-revolutionary activity, where he is putting the very same methods into practice.

[Tsvetov] In this way, having given Central American affairs to a specialist in fascist coups, the Washington administration is swearing at the same time that it does not plan to try to overthrow the Sandinist Government in Nicaragua. It swears and at the same time states that it will not endure that government since it maintains too close a friendship, in the opinion of the Washington administration, with Cuba and the Soviet Union. A curious expression was used by THE WASHINGTON POST, which wrote: The President -- I am talking about President Reagan -- will not be content until the Sandinist Government of Nicaragua is either toppled or fundamentally reshaped. This is curious in that it dots the i's; it points quite specifically to the goal of the Washington administration.

[Sobolev] The real reason for the American Administration's hatred for the Sandinists is no secret. The emotional fits of the Washington leadership are governed by the readout of an electronic calculator. Speaking the other day, the President said: We have formulated creative initiatives that make it possible to strengthen the standing of private enterprise in the Caribbean basin. A certain General (Butler) is well-known in the United States: He was a commander of the Marines at the beginning of the century. He wrote in his memoirs: I helped make Mexico secure for American oil interests, I helped to make Cuba and Haiti obey the boys from the National City Bank, I gave the green light for American sugar interests in the Dominican Republic, I helped to sort things out in Honduras for American fruit companies and I helped to clean up Nicaragua for the Brown brothers' international banking house. Those were the general's boasts. But shortly after his punitive operations, Augusto Sandino, Farabundo Marti and many other patriots emerged in Central America. They demonstrated to the American interventionists the strength of the armed people.

The Americans would appear to have been taught numerous lessons on this score, but, either because they did not learn their lesson, or because they cannot help it, they continue to be taught lessons by the Latin Americans. An example of such a lesson was the shameful rout of Playa Giron in Cuba, the anniversary of which was observed this week. Also this week, American mercenaries were trounced in Nicaragua. The CIA had sent them into a general offensive in an attempt on the field of battle to cover the shame of their Washington patrons, who were caught mining Nicaraguan ports and were forced to promise that this piratical activity would cease. It has transpired in the last few days that the Americans have not just been laying mines off the Nicaraguan coast with their own hands but that frogmen had been landed -- members of the CIA apparatus -- and had blown up onshore installations. Also that U.S. Marines' ships had given fire support to counterrevolutionaries during an attack on the coastal settlement of San Juan del Norte, just as had happened in the invasion at Playa Giron 23 years ago.

If you consider that the American Air Force penetrates Nicaraguan airspace in order to drop ammunition for the Somozists, then you have to conclude that the United States' undeclared war against Nicaragua is being waged with all branches of the U.S. Armed Forces. Thus, for the International Court at The Hague, which this week is to examine charges of aggression against Nicaragua levelled at the United States, there is an increasing amount of material. Washington has declared that it will not recognize the verdict of the court, realizing in advance what the verdict must be since the U.S. Government keeps hearing from every quarter condemnations of its anti-Nicaraguan actions.

[Gerasimov] The United States' policy in Central America is of course not supported either by the United States' NATO allies, or America's neighbors in the south or north. For instance, MacEachen, the Canadian secretary of state for external affairs and deputy prime minister, has said: We have differences of views with the United States, and these differences have become even more evident on the issue of the mining of Nicaraguan ports. The U.S. interference has complicated the situation in the region. That is Canada's assessment. Mexico feels the same, as I have said.

[Tsvetov] On that, I would like to finish our roundtable discussion. All the best. Good-bye.

CRITICISM OF L.A. OLYMPICS' MANAGEMENT, COST

Borisov: Most Expensive Ever

LD211055 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Borisov writes: The 1984 summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles will go down in the history of the international sport movement as the most expensive to their participants and guests.

The newspaper WALL STREET JOURNAL, spokesman for the American business community, conceded that the Olympics were seen as private property and a source of profits in the United States.

The Olympic gold rush has affected diverse sections of the American population, primarily the propertied classes which are going to make bucks by whipping up the prices of everything, from accommodation and food to car hire services. Pleading the status of a private organization that has been denied funds by the government, the organizing committee (LAOOC) strives to rake in maximum profits, while making minimum spending. The services offered by the LAOOC (not a single of them free) are incompatible with their real cost.

Let us remember, for comparison's sake, what a day's accommodation cost an Olympian at previous games: Montreal -- 15 dollars and Moscow -- 18 dollars. In Los Angeles the sum will stand at 35 dollars, or nearly twice as many as four years ago. No wonder that broad participation in the coming games by sportsmen from a number of developing countries is still in question, even despite financial support from the International Olympic Committee (the IOC fully pays for six Olympians to go to the games). The national olympic committees of these countries just cannot afford to send bigger teams to Los Angeles.

The "fine" conditions offered to the Olympic family in the United States include accommodation at university dormitories and tiring, many-mile-long rides from there to competition and training venues. Irrespective of the results the athletes will be able to show in these conditions, the spectators will have to pay record money to watch tired sportsmen compete in the suffocating smog of Los Angeles. A ticket to the spartan opening ceremony, for example, cost 200 dollars, while spectators in Moscow paid 25 roubles (33 dollars) for a ticket there.

Besides, some 15 percent of the tickets at the last games were made available to children for free -- a fine example of promoting sport and the ideals of the Olympic movement.

The visitors' books in the 1980 Olympic Village and the hotels in Moscow, Tallin, Kiev, Leningrad and Minsk were full of enthusiastic comments praising the hosts' hospitality, well-wishing attitudes and fine cuisine. "Nice food" was one of the most frequent entries made by visitors, among whom newsmen were the most fastidous. Nobody complained of high prices. Low costs do not draw any criticisms. Whereas in 1980 an accredited correspondent had to pay from 18 to 36 dollars for a day's stay in Moscow, in Los Angeles accomodation will cost him from to 35 to 140 dollars. Food will also cost accordingly: A breakfast, the Californian restaurant association said, will cost nine to 15 dollars.

The Swiss newspaper JOURNAL DE GENEVE summed up the openly commercial attitudes to the Olympics, sportsmen and guests in the United States aptly in a headline, which said: "Los Angeles 84 or a thousand and one ways of making ... or spending money in a record short time."

LAOOC 'Scandals' Scored

LD211335 Moscow TASS in English 1221 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 21 TASS -- Pointing out the complicated situation that has formed during the preparations for the 1984 Summer Olympics, the newspaper SOVETSKIY SPORT in today's issue urges the officials responsible for holding the Los Angeles Olympics to recall the words of the Olympic oath made by each of them, to the effect that they pledge to serve the Olympic movement to the best of their abilities, to observe and make others observe all the provisions of the Olympic Charter and decisions of the International Olympic Committee. The newspaper cites an extract from this document.

However, sports lovers all over the world ponder over the question today: How could the IOC gloss over the cases of gross violation of the rules, provisions and spirit of the Olympic Charter, which were not permitted earlier at any other Olympics?

SOVETSKIY SPORT draws attention to the fact that to no other city has the IOC shown such forebearance, as to Los Angeles from the very first days after the right to organize the Olympics was granted to it. No other organizing committee and no other country have been permitted to violate the Olympic Charter for so long and on so many occasions.

Recalling the recent history, the newspaper points out that the first scandal flared up as early as in 1978. At that time the candidature of Los Angeles as the venue of the 1984 Olympics (the only one, by the way) was approved at an IOC session in Athens. Immediately after that Los Angeles refused to pay to the IOC the sum stipulated by the Charter. Only after a long delay, after endless altercations, the sum was paid.

Only in 1982 -- after a delay of four years! -- the IOC was given written guarantees by President Reagan of the U.S. to the effect that the U.S. Administration would observe traditions, rules and provisions of the Olympic Charter.

There will be several Olympic Villages in Los Angeles, which is also a violation of the Olympic Charter. The IOC has reconciled itself to it, the newspaper writes further. The term of the athletes' staying in the Olympic Village before the beginning of the games was illegally reduced from three weeks to two, which is also known by the IOC.

The organizing committee of Los Angeles forced the IOC to demand that the participating countries make the preliminary payment before March 1.

PEACE COMMITTEE CHIEF ZHUKOV SPEAKS ON TV

OW211001 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian (Orbita-2) at 0839 GMT on 21 April carries its scheduled 30-minute program "Talk by Yu.A. Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace."

Zhukov devotes the first 10 minutes of the program to comparing "intentions and future plans" formulated in April by Soviet and U.S. leaders. He briefly outlines Soviet policies defined by Chernenko in his 12 April speech on fulfilling the current 5-year plan, preparing for the 12th 5-Year Plan period, and implementing an "active foreign policy" aimed at peace and security. Zhukov compares this with U.S. plans, citing President Reagan's 6 April speech at Georgetown University and the recent secret Directive No 138, and outlines U.S. military interference in Central America, including the mining of Nicaraguan ports. He then reads a letter from a Nicaraguan student studying in the USSR, whose family was attacked by a "counterrevolutionary band" from Honduras.

The remainder of the program deals with mass antiwar movements in Western Europe, visits by foreign peace delegations to the Soviet Union, activities by Soviet peace organizations, and letters from Soviet peace activists.

In conclusion, Zhukov notes that the next program will be in June to discuss results of "mass actions for the defense of peace" that will be organized by the defense of peace committee scheduled for May.

U.S. OBSTRUCTS PROGRESS AT UN ECE SESSION

PM191027 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Apr 84 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Kuznetsov report "On A Topical Theme": "United Nations: For a Constructive Approach"]

[Text] Geneva -- The 39th session of the UN ECE has ended. During the final stage of the 2-week session a difficult struggle developed over decisions on the directions of the commission's future activity. If you analyze the positions of the ECE countries and the speeches by the delegation heads during the general debate you inevitably encounter two approaches to economic cooperation in Europe.

The political watershed at the session was the question of the attitude toward fulfillment of the Madrid meeting's mandate in the sphere of implementation of measures on the development of economic ties in the interests of strengthening detente in Europe. The Soviet Union and the socialist community countries went to Geneva seeking cooperation with all the other ECE states, to make a constructive contribution to the commission's work, and to make it an effective instrument for the implementation of the relevant provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and the Concluding Document of the Madrid meeting.

The specific proposals put forward at the session by the socialist countries' representatives included measures in removing obstacles to regional trade, renouncing forms of discrimination and the use of sanctions, and so forth. The socialist states' delegations proposed the adoption of a series of recommendations on the development of mutually advantageous cooperation in the transportation, energy, and environmental conservation spheres. They stressed that it is not only the socialist countries that are interested in developing this kind of cooperation.

But contrary to common sense and their own economic interests, the Western countries continue to erect numerous trade and political barriers restricting the development of economic and scientific and technical ties with the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries. This approach, geared to undermining regional cooperation, was displayed at the session by the U.S. delegation. At the plenary meetings the representatives of the Reagan administration set out to shift tension from the political sphere to the sphere of East-West economic relations and to use them to bring overt pressure to bear on the socialist countries.

The U.S. delegation went to the session with an empty portfolio, and its representatives did not put forward a single constructive proposal on creating an atmosphere of trust and a favorable climate for the development of trade and economic ties in the European Continent. The overt political hustling, pressure and calls for "Atlantic solidarity" and "NATO discipline" brought a protest at the session from West European countries.

Assessing the session results, Soviet delegation member Ye.N. Makeyev said that they could have been more substantial. The session failed to effect improvements in such important spheres of ECE activity as trade and industrial cooperation, transport, science and technology, as well as the sphere of confidence-building measures in international economic relations. At the same time the adoption of the main resolution and the commission's work program for 1984-1988 should be viewed positively. The implementation of these documents should aid the development of cooperation between the ECE countries.

U.S. MANEUVERS SEEN AS REAL REHEARSAL FOR WAR

PM201518 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Apr 84 First Edition p 5

[Yu. Gavrilov "Commentary": "Rehearsal With a Threat"]

[Text] The facts attest that the Pentagon is indefatigably rehearsing in practice how to wage conventional and "limited" and "protracted" nuclear wars. We note that recently, as the U.S. NBC television company reported, a..."rehearsal for the start of World War III" (!) was held at a U.S. military base in South Dakota where nuclear weapons are stored.

The successive military exercises and maneuvers by the U.S. Armed Forces are also a real rehearsal for war. In recent years they have assumed a huge scale and are becoming increasingly difficult to distinguish from the real deployment of armed forces for aggression. The unprecedentedly large-scale provocative military maneuevers code-named "Global Shield-84," which ended last week, are essentially of this ilk.

In these maneuvers, the sixth of this type, the Pentagon staffs verified the readiness of their Armed Forces to wage war and inflict a first nuclear strike on targets located on the Soviet Union's territory.

The U.S. Defense Department stated that these exercises rehearsed operations by subunits of the U.S. Strategic Air Command including strategic bombers with nuclear weapons on board and ICBM's. Launches of "Minuteman" ICBM's were also carried out in the Pacific Ocean region, as were test launches of cruise missiles from aircraft. Troops from the North American Air Defense Command and other forces designated for waging nuclear war took part in the maneuvers. Canada, a number of NATO countries, and Japan were involved in the war games. A total of 150,000 troops took part.

"Global Shield-84" is only one link in a whole chain of provocative large-scale militarist games regularly staged by washington throughout the world. There is unceasing saber rattling in Europe, where the United States is dragging the troops of its NATO bloc allies into maneuvers. Many such maneuvers are held there. Suffice it to say that the maneuvers held under the title "Autumn Forge-83" involved up to 300,000 servicemen from the NATO countries. Nor is the Pentagon overlooking other regions of the world. More than 200,000 servicemen took part in the "Team Spirit-84" U.S. and South Korean exercises, which have just ended. Militarist demonstrations off the coasts of Japan, in international waters in the Near East and Africa, and near Nicaragua and Cuba -- there is on counting all the dangerous manifestations of Washington's gamble on the "use of force" in international relations for the sake of achieving the maniacal idea of securing military superiority and foisting the U.S. imperial setup on the world.

A vivid example of this is the latest provocative military maneuvers in the Caribbean. They will begin in the next few days under the code name "Ocean Venture-84." About 30,000 servicemen will take part in the maneuvers. They will rehearse the landing of a force on Vieques Island, which belongs to Puerto Rico, and also the "defense" of the U.S. base at Guantanamo, which is on the part of Cuban territory that the United States has illegally occupied since 1898. As well as ground units, the 82d Airborne Division, Marine subunits, 250 warplanes, including B-52 bombers, and a naval armada headed by the aircraft carrier America will take part in "Ocean Venture-84." It is noteworthy that the cutthroats of the 82d Division were the main shock force during the American military's recent invasion of Grenada.

But even this is by no means all. Manuevers involving five NATO countries will begin the next Thursday in the Mediterranean.

Any unbiased observer is bound to ask the reasonable question: How is this unbridled militarist marathon spurred on by the United States to be reconciled with the U.S. leaders' assurances of their desire for "peace" and "dialogue" and of their readiness for cooperation with the Soviet Union and other countries in the quest to eliminate the threat of nuclear conflict and for the prevention of local hotbeds of tension? The answer is provided by the statement by Gus Hall, general secretary of the U.S. Communist Party, published in New York a few days ago. The present election rhetoric of Reagan, who is going on about peace and the resumption of talks with the USSR, the leader of the American Communists declared, is merely a propaganda maneuver whereby he is attempting to divert attention from the U.S. preparations for nuclear war.

PONOMAREV: WASHINGTON DEAF TO SOVIET PROPOSALS

LD211014 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The Soviet Union unilaterally assumed the obligation not to be the first to put anti-satellite weapons into outer space and is unswervingly observing it. Moreover, on Soviet initiative the 33rd session of the U.N. General Assembly considered a Soviet draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in space and from space against targets on earth and included constructive Soviet proposals in a special resolution, which was approved by most of the participants in the session.

But what was the Reagan administration's response to those peaceful steps of the USSR? It can be summed up as war preparations and the undermining of bilateral agreements with the Soviet Union. The T.V. company ABC reported in its news program on Thursday that Reagan was not going to conduct with the Soviet Union talks on the prohibition of anti-satellite weapons. Recently the U.S. President officially notified the Congress that his government was about to start an extensive program of the arms race in outer space and had no intention to seek agreement with the Soviet Union to prevent the militarisation of space, presumably because of verification difficulties.

Reagan's position on these problems of utmost importance to the preservation of peace is characteristic of his overall policy of preparing and provoking a nuclear conflict with the Soviet Union. There is a treaty between the USA and the USSR on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defence systems, concluded in 1972 in perpetuity, which prohibits, in particular, the development of space-based weapons systems of this type. Nevertheless, it is this goal that is being currently pursued by the "Reagan team." The U.S. Administration deliberately frustrated the process of limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons and foiled the talks on both strategic armaments and nuclear weapons in Europe. U.S. officials hint that they are thinking of brushing aside completely the restrictions imposed by the SALT-2 accord. Next year the United States plans to float its seventh modern nuclear submarine carrying 24 nuclear-tipped ballistic missles.

ABC notes that if by that time analogous American weapons are not scrapped, the United States will exceed the "ceiling" fixed by the SALT-1 and SALT-2 accords, which the USA and the USSR have agreed to respect. However, according to the T.V. company, Secretary of State Shultz refused to say during recent congressional hearings what the United States intended to do when the new submarine was floated, thus giving rise to the suspicion that the USA might waive the limitations imposed by the treaties.

The Soviet Union has been working for quite a number of years now to reach an agreement with the United States to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space. The militarisation of space would entail formidable consequences for mankind as a whole. But the Washington leaders pointedly turn a deaf ear to sensible appeals from Moscow.

TREATMENT OF SOVIETS IN U.S. CRITICIZED

LD202129 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 19 Apr 84

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Two years ago, when President Reagan was looking for a pretext to spoil U.S.-Soviet relations, Glen Cove, a small community near New York, got into the limelight. Glen Cove is where Soviet diplomats and their families spend weekends at their state and municipal recreation areas. So 2 years ago the Republican mayor, Alan Parente, accused the Soviets of running a spy net at the estate. Following the charges, the Municipal Council banned the Soviets from local beaches, tennis courts, and other facilities. Federal authorities never confirmed the charges, nor have they bothered to refute them. This was enough to lead anti-Soviet feelings to a boiling point.

Then a new mayor comes. He is Democrat Vincent Suozzi and it turns out that there was no need for any ban, that the Soviets did nothing outrageous and those Russians are not after all such bad guys. Mayor Suozzi put it in the following way -- and I quote: The Soviets have acted in good faith, have shown a constructive interest in our city, and have indicated by words and deeds that they want to be good neighbors. Unquote.

But what's happened over those 2 years at Glen Cove except for a change of mayors? Almost the same diplomats work in New York now as when Alan Parente was in charge. Like in those times, they still go to Glen Cove on weekends and lead the same life there. Only they may be playing less tennis or do less swimming than before the ban. The Soviets did not become any worse or better than in the times of the former Glen Cove mayor. It's just that Alan Parente wanted a scandal. So did the administration, although it formally took Parente to court for his ban; this was never concealed. When, for instance, a 400-strong mob broke through the gates into the Soviet compound at Glen Cove carrying posters "Kill the Russians" and vandalized Soviet property, the police acted like idle onlookers. No serious steps were taken when several bombs were set off at a Soviet residential compound in New York and in other similar cases. But instead words like the evil empire were abundant in the 3 years of the administration's tenure. It appears that Soviet citizens in the United States, who live in an atmosphere of constant fear for their families, must have their own idea about where that evil empire is situated.

At present, there is very serious concern that Soviet athletes may learn the same from their personal experience if they decide to go to Los Angeles. They may learn what it feels to become a target of an anti-Soviet hysteria in America -- hopefully not in the word's direct sense [as heard]. After all, if the Reagan administration couldn't or didn't want to provide security for Soviet diplomats, who can guarantee the security of athletes?

PRC'S HISTORIC CLAIMS TO USSR TERRITORY REFUTED

PM171406 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 15, Apr 84 pp 23-25

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences Prof V. Yasenev: "What Is the Object of These 'Historical Studies?'"]

[Text] At the present time when imperialism is aggravating conflict situations everywhere the imperative need for better relations between nations is self-evident. Improvement of China's relations with its neighbours would have a salutary effect on the political climate in Asia and in the rest of the world, for that matter.

The countries adjoining the People's Republic of China have long stood for normalization of interstate relations with it. The Soviet Union has advanced a wide-ranging programme for the positive development of Soviet-Chinese relations. All the proposals made by the U.S.S.R. in the course of the dialogue between the two countries in recent years remain in force, including the proposal for a joint declaration on the principles of their relations. The Soviet Union has also urged China to join in a freeze on nuclear arsenals and in working out confidence-building measures for the Far Eastern region. In all this it has the support of other states in the area.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has advanced a proposal for a bilateral treaty with China on the principles of peaceful coexistence. Laos and Kampuchea have made similar proposals. The Mongolian People's Republic has suggested concluding a convention on mutual renunciation of the use of force among the countries of Asia and the Pacific. India is negotiating with China on the normalization of Indian-Chinese relations, including a settlement of their frontier dispute.

Chinese diplomacy, on its part, maintains that in its relations with other countries the P.R.C. is invariably guided by the five principles of peaceful coexistence, the first of which is mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity. Chinese leaders have given assurances that the "P.R.C. is interested in maintaining and promoting good-neighbourly relations with its neighbours."

But while talking about the need for a peaceful settlement of frontier issues with its neighbours through negotiations and emphasizing that the important thing in improving relations is not words but deeds, in practice China far from always respects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of neighbouring countries, following a line that has little in common with its avowed policy.

The continuing campaign in China to propound the false thesis of "historical injustice" with regard to its frontiers in no way tallies with the principles of peaceful coexistence and good-neighbourship. Moreover, the tone of this campaign is set by official spokesmen. For instance, during his visit to the United States in January this year the Chinese premier, in an interview to THE NEW YORK TIMES, again spoke of the "inequality" of the Russian-Chinese treaties defining the frontiers between the two countries.

The contention that the present frontiers of the P.R.C. are "unjust" is bolstered up by invoking the "single Chinese nation" theory, by falsification of historical facts to make it appear as if substantial territories of adjoining countries "belonged historically" to China.

According to that theory, China always existed as a multinational state irrespective of the succession of feudal dynasties and of which nationality ruled the country. On the strength of this contention the non-Han peoples inhabiting 60 per cent of the territory of the P.R.C. and also a number of nationalities in the neighbouring countries are declared part of the Chinese nation and the territories they inhabit are regarded as an integral part of the Chinese state. Those of these territories which now are not inside the P.R.C. are designated as "lost Chinese lands."

The "theory" is constantly propounded by central and local propaganda media. For instance, the journal HONGQI in its third issue for this year declared that all the nationalities inhabiting China today, and there are more than 50 of them, contributed to China's historical development over a long period of time, each nationality having subordinated its own national and class interests to the "unity and benefit of the single Chinese nation."

The concept of territories of neighbouring countries "historically belonging" to China is based on the claim that wherever a Chinese warrior set foot hundreds or thousands of years ago is China. According to the logic of the proponents of the Great-Han theories, any non-Chinese peoples that invaded China likewise became members of the "single Chinese nation." China's trade or exchange of emissaries with neighbouring countries is invoked as confirmation of this thesis. Trade with these countries is interpreted as evidence of a "tributary" relationship -- it was on these grounds that they were declared "vassals."

Since history does not provide confirmation of such conceptions, the P.R.C. has gone in for plain distortion of historical facts. Although Chinese publications now carry lengthy articles on the need for a Marxist approach to historical research, this is promptly forgotten when it comes to the history of China's frontiers.

The theory that China was once far bigger than it is today is mainly propounded by university bulletins and the provincial press. But, then, as the saying goes, you don't need a whole box of matches to set a dry haystack on fire -- one match is enough.

It is noteworthy that Chinese propaganda is now concentrating on concocting and circulating "arguments" to back up "historical claims" to territories belonging to the Soviet Union.

On the pretext of making "an objective study of history" publication is encouraged in China of all manner of "evidence" of alleged seizure of Chinese territory by Russia, of the supposedly "unequal" nature of treaties defining the present Soviet-Chinese frontiers. For instance, the newspaper GONGREN RIBAO published in its February 1, 1983, issue an article entitled "Tsarist Russia Seized Vast Chinese Territories" which maintained that "in the course of 50 years beginning with the mid-19th century" tsarist Russia severed from Qing China (under Russian-Chinese treaties which the article qualified as "unequal") 1.5 million sq. km. of territory in the Far East, Kazakhstan, and Central Asia.

A similar article, entitled "Seizure of Chinese Territory by Tsarist Russia," was published by the journal JIEFANGJUN HUABAO (ARMY ILLUSTRATED) in April 1983. And in June the socio-political journal BAN YUE TAN also expatiated on "territorial conquests" by Russia and "encroachment on China's interests." In an article by Bu Ping entitled "Study of the History of the Eastern Sector of the Sino-Russian Frontier" in XUEXI YU TAN-SUO (STUDY AND SEARCH), No. 6, 1983, the emphasis is laid on the allegedly "forcible" establishment of the Russian-Chinese frontier in the mid-19th century.

The authors of the article "Independence and Self-Reliance -- A Summary of China's Historical Experience Over the Past 100-Odd Years," published in the journal JUNDAISHI YANJIU (STUDY OF MODERN HISTORY), No. 2, April 1983, shamelessly equate Soviet territories of Hong Kong and Taiwan which were severed from China as a result of the imperialist power politics of Britain, Japan and the U.S.A. and which still remain under foreign control.

Particular activity in publishing such materials is displayed by the more than 20 institutes and societies for the study of the U.S.S.R. set up in Beijing and in the provinces. But pride of place in the publication of articles about territories "lost" by China is held by institutions and propaganda media in the three northeastern provinces bordering on the U.S.S.R. -- Liaoning, Heilongjiang and Jilin -- and also in the Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region.

Indicative in this respect is an article by Su Beihai entitled "Tsarist Russia's Aggression Against the Kazakh Junior Zhus" [Footnote: Zhus -- Association of clans in feudal Kazakhstan based on political, economic and territorial identity. Kazakhstan was divided into three zhuses: Senior, Middle and Junior.] in the Xinjiang University Bulletin, No. 1, January 1983. The author not only grossly misrepresents the history of relations between Kazakhstan and Russia, but declares the Kazakhs a nation that had allegedly dwelt within the bounds of China "from the beginning of time." Hence the contention that the "Kazakhs, who have belonged to China since time immemorial" have always "yearned for their homeland, China." In his articles in issues Nos. 2 and 3 of the bulletin, about "tsarist Russia's aggression" against the Middle and Senior Kazakh Zhuses, Su Beihai accused Russia of nothing more nor less than the "seizure" of some 2.7 million sq. km. of Kazakh lands. It is easy to see that these fabrications are a thinly disguised attempt to include the entire territory of Soviet Kazakhstan in the lands "lost" by China to Russia.

Practically at the same time the bulletin of the Central Institute for Nationalities published in Beijing carried an article by Du Rongkun entitled "The Aggression of Tsarist Russia and the Kirghiz People's Resistance Struggle." As if vying with his colleague, he described also the Kirghiz and the Tajiks as "part of the peoples of China." By the same token the areas inhabited by these peoples were included in the former "Chinese territories." On February 21, 1984, the RENMIN RIBAO printed an article entitled "The Kirghiz Inhabiting the Northwest Border Areas of Our Country," stating that during the Tang Dynasty (7th-10th centuries) the Kirghiz nomad areas on the upper reaches of the Yenisey became "an integral part of China." When the Kirghiz later spread out all the way to the Pamirs they nevertheless, the paper claimed, continued their migrations within the confines of "Chinese lands" and even protected China's frontiers from intrusion by "British and Russian imperialism."

The Kazakh historians Sadvakasov and Shalekenov have given a fitting rebuff to the attempts of the Chinese to misrepresent the history of Kazakhstan and Central Asia. (Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, No. 4, 1983.) Judging by the latest Chinese publications, the two Soviet scholars observe, "the claims of the P.R.C. to the territory of the Kazakh S.S.R. are growing and are no longer confined to areas east and south of Lake Balkhash. They are now reaching out to the territory of the former Junior Zhus, i.e. Soviet territory west of Lake Balkhash thousands of kilometres from the frontiers of the P.R.C. and essentially extending to the entire territory of Kazakhstan."

It should be noted that the "arguments" used by some Chinese historians to support the claims to the territory of neighbouring countries can be traced back to the ideology and politics of feudal times. These "arguments" are obviously far-fetched, and not only Soviet scholars think so.

The well-known British investigator of Asian frontier problems Alastair Lamb pointed out as far back as 15 years ago that the payment of tribute by peoples that successfully fought the invaders from the Celestial Empire and drove them out could not be regarded as grounds for declaring the territories inhabited by these peoples as "belonging historically to China." The Kazakhs living on the territory of the U.S.S.R. could not be considered "Chinese by origin" inasmuch as most of their forebears had only trade relations with the Manchus, and only a few Kazakh tribes paid tribute to the Chinese emperors. This could not be considered justification for territorial claims, Alastair Lamb stressed.

Why is this campaign of falsification of history being continued in China? It is well known that the Soviet Union owes no territorial "debts" to China, and that it has no territorial claims on China. Is Beijing not perhaps trying to justify some specific foreign policy concepts by doctoring the historical record? The myth about the Soviet "threat" to China's security, for instance. The fact, however, is that the Soviet Union never threatened China and is not threatening it now. This is evidenced not only by the entire history of Soviet-Chinese relations but also by the steps towards their normalization taken latterly by the U.S.S.R.

Nevertheless prejudice against Russia has for many years been inculcated in the population of China. The thesis of "territorial conquests" and "subjugation" by tsarist Russia of "Chinese lands and peoples" is reflected, among other things, in geographical and historical maps and atlases. Indicative in this respect is the school map of China during the Qing Dynasty (1644-1911) published in 1981 by the Ditu Chubanshe Publishers in Shanghai. It shows all the territorial claims on the Soviet Union. This "concept" is widely presented also in textbooks and teaching aids, including textbooks for junior secondary and secondary schools and history programmes for applicants for enrollment of higher educational establishments and for leading party and government workers attending advanced training courses.

At the beginning of this year, for instance, a set of historical maps showing the territories that supposedly belonged to China at the time of the Tang Dynasty was put on sale in Beijing. Intended for secondary schools, they were designed to prove that huge territories including the whole of Kazakhstan and other Soviet Central Asian republics, part of eastern Siberia and the Maritime Territory with Sakhalin Island, and also all of Mongolia, large parts of Afghanistan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Vietnam and India, had been Chinese "from time immemorial."

The journal XUE LILUN (STUDY OF THEORY) published by the Harbin City Committee of the Communist Party of China carried in its issue No. 6 for last year a specimen of a questionnaire for party workers enrolling for study courses. Students were required to give the dates and titles of the Russian-Chinese frontier treaties under which tsarist Russia had "annexed Chinese territories" and the size of these territories.

The "additional reading matter" on the subject of "tsarist Russia's aggression" published in pedagogical journals is of a similar character. For instance, LISHI JIAOXUE (TEACHING OF HISTORY), No. 5, 1983, printed a guide to teachers on the subject of "tsarist Russian's aggression in Northeast China and the war between Japan and Russia for the conquest of that area." Teachers were recommended to lay the emphasis on "elucidation of the Russian aggression" and to draw the attention of the pupils to the "seizure by tsarist Russia of more than one million square kilometres of Chinese territory north of the Heilongjiang (Amur) River and east of the Wusulijiang (Ussuri) River." The same issue contained lectures for young workers listing "the territories seized from China by tsarist Russia" and giving the size of the areas "severed" under "unequal treaties" and even "over and above" the areas stipulated in them.

Besides the articles in the periodical press, increasing importance is attached to "basic" studies designed to demonstrate the "predatory" character of tsarist Russia's policy with regard to China throughout the history of relations between the two countries. Three volumes of a four-volume "History of the Aggression of Tsarist Russia in China" have been put on the book market. At the same time, so-called short "historical novels" distorting the true picture of the development of Silberia and the Far East by Russia continue to be published and republished.

All this shows that this is not a matter of some sort of errors on the part of individual Chinese historians. What is in question is a planned, systematic, officially sanctioned propaganda campaign.

What, one might ask, is the object of these "historical studies"? The object can hardly be said to be a serious, scholarly treatment of the facts of history. It is enough in this connection to note that the criticism by Marx, Engels and Lenin of the policy of Russian tsarism towards China continues to be used in the P.R.C. for anti-Soviet purposes despite the fact that this policy was condemned by our party from the very outset and that the Soviet state ever since its inception has been pursuing a Leninist policy towards China, a policy according with the fundamental interests of the two great neighbouring peoples.

It should also be emphasized that when it annulled all the secret treaties by means of which Russian tsarism and its imperialist allies fettered China, the Soviet Government did not question, and has never questioned, the validity of the territorial provisions of the treaties and agreements that have defined the historically conditioned Soviet-Chinese fronter. As is known, the frontier treaties and frontier provisions of relevant agreements were not secret. Moreover, as distinct from all other international agreements, frontier treaties under international law are not subject to annulment either in the event of internal changes, or even in the event of war between states bordering on each other. Consequently, the treaties relating to the Russian-Chinese frontiers remain valid to this day.

The appearance in the P.R.C. of publications of the kind discussed here show that territorial claims on the U.S.S.R., however disguised, remain a component of the policy and methods of indoctrination of party and government workers and military personnel, the youth, and indeed the entire population in a spirit hostile to the Soviet Union. Clearly, this is not conducive to the improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Soviet people would like to hope that the actions of the P.R.C. in all aspects of Sino-Soviet relations, political, historical, etc., will be based on a real desire to normalize these relations.

WU XUEQIAN TRIES TO WHITEWASH U.S. MISSILE POLICY

LD131359 Moscow TASS in English 1248 GMT 13 Apr 84

[Text] Paris April 13 TASS -- Wu Xueqian, minister of foreign affairs of the People's Republic of China, completed his visit to France the other day. He was received by President Francois Mitterrand and External Relations Minister Claude Cheysson. He also had political consultations with officials of the European Economic Community.

Wu Xueqian appeared on French television, stating China's well-known position on the Kampuchean problem and on Sino-Vietnamese relations. He also discussed Euromissiles and China's relations with the Soviet Union. Touching upon medium-range missiles in Europe, the Chinese foreign minister actually tried to whitewash the U.S. policy of deploying Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in Western Europe, using as a cover-up appeals for early talks between the "two superpowers."

Wu Xueqian said that China intended to improve relations with the Soviet Union and that the two sides had already had in a calm atmosphere four rounds of consultations. He added that certain progress had been achieved in economic and trade relations.

UK MINISTER IN PRC FOR TALKS ON HONG KONG

LD161506 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 16 Apr 84

[Text] Beijing April 16 TASS -- Britain's Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Geoffrey Howe has arrived here for a three-day official visit. Later he is to fly to Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong. During his stay in Beijing Geoffrey Howe is to hold talks with Wu Xueqian, minister of foreign affairs of the People's Republic of China. According to a spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, the main subject to be discussed during the talks is the Hong Kong issue. The British lease on that territory expires in 1997. According to the British Broadcasting Corporation, the Chinese side insists that agreement on the future of Hong Kong be reached by September 1984. The British newspaper GUARDIAN writes that there is a lot of other issues in British-Chinese relations which should be discussed.

CHINESE ARTIST'S BIRTHDAY MARKED IN MOSCOW

OW141225 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 13 Apr 84

[Text] Jointly sponsored by the USSR Union of Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, and the Eastern People's Art Museum, a painting exhibit marking Qi Bashi's 120th birthday opened on 13 April in the above-mentioned museum in Moscow. Among those attending the opening ceremony were activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, artists, representatives from various circles in Moscow, and Chinese Embassy personnel headed by [Ambassador] Yang Shouzheng. Soviet art critic (Chavavoskiy) spoke on Qi Bashi's art works at the opening ceremony. Ambassador Yang Shouzheng also delivered a speech. All speakers emphasized the outstanding contributions that Qi Bashi made to the treasurehouse of world art.

SOVIET GYMNASTS LOSE TO CHINESE IN BEIJING

LD222007 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 22 Apr 84

[Text] Beijing April 22 TASS -- The gymnastics team from the people's Republic of China have won an important international tournament of twelve nations with a total of 176.85 points. The USSR, which did not bring their very best gymnasts, placed second with 175.5 points, and the German Democratic Republic placed third with 173.05. Li Ning of the PRC won the individual competition with 59.4 points. Yuriy Balabanov of the USSR placed second with 59.0, and Lou Yun (PRC) third with 58.6. The Shoudu Palace of Sports was packed to capacity. The spectators warmly cheered the gymnasts.

BRIEFS

SINO-RUSSIAN DICTIONARY -- The Soviet magazine ASIA and AFRICA TODAY reports the publication of the first two volumes of the latest Sino-Russian dictionary. A big group of Soviet sinologists has completed their many years of work. The dictionary contains over 250,000 words and expressions reflecting the vocabulary and phraseology of the Chinese language to the fullest extent possible. [Text] [Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 20 Apr 84 LD]

SOVIET FAR EAST-HOKKAIDO AMITY MEETING CONCLUDES

Vorotnikov Sends Greetings

LD191415 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 19 Apr 84

[Text] Khabarovsk April 19 TASS -- Representatives of public of the Soviet Far East and Hokkaido Island have declared for actively contributing towards a widening of political contacts, developing regional trade and economic cooperation, cultural, sports, and tourist exchanges and friendly exchanges between public organisations and associated cities. The first such meeting has closed here today.

The meeting was attended by representatives of public of territories and regions of Siberia and the Soviet Far East, the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, foreign trade, merchant marine and fisheries organisations. The Japanese delegation, which was led by MP from the Socialist Party of Japan, member of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan Toshiharu Okada included Japanese MPs, deputies of the prefectural assembly of Hokkaido, businessmen, leaders of trade unions, representatives of tourist firms and mass media.

The participants in the meeting ardently welcomed the messages of greetings addressed to them by member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Governor of Hokkaido Prefecture Takahiro Yokomichi and other persons and organisations.

In the course of four days the members of the Soviet and Japanese delegations discussed in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cooperation at their plenary meetings and three commissions questions pertaining to the present-day international situation, including in the Far East.

The jointly adopted communique points out that the development of the Soviet-Japanese links, all-round cooperation in various fields accords with the interests of the peoples of both countries and could really contribute towards building a climate of confidence and well-wishing in the Far East, strengthening peace and security in Asia and all over the world. It is important not only to preserve and strengthen, but also to develop further everything positive that has been achieved in relations between the Soviet Union and Japan in the course of a long time.

Agreement has been reached that the next such meeting will be held in Hokkaido in 1985.

Communique Issued

OW220225 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] The following is a joint communique adopted at the first exchange meeting of representatives of various circles from Hokkaido and the Soviet Far East for friendship, goodneighborliness, and cooperation in the Far East.

The first exchange meeting of representatives of various circles from Hokkaido and the Soviet Far East for friendship, goodneighborliness, and cooperation in the Far East was held 13 to 20 April, 1984 in Khabarovsk, sponsored by the Executive Committee of the Japanese-Soviet Council for Exchange Between the Soviet Far East and Hokkaido on the Japanese side, and the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries and the USSR-Japan Society on the Soviet side.

The meeting was attended by approximately 300 leaders and activists of political, local administrative, and private organizations as well as representatives from trade and fishery circles, news media, and various other circles in the Soviet Far East and other regions of the Russian Federation and Hokkaido. Messages were sent to the meeting from Hokkaido Governor Takahiro Yokomichi and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Vorotnikov.

The meeting was held in a friendly atmosphere of mutual understanding and practical cooperation.

At the plenary meetings and three subcommittee meetings, the participants discussed questions on the international economic situation, including that in the Far East; Japanese-Soviet relations, including regional cooperation in various sectors between the Soviet Far East and Hokkaido; and the further development and strengthening of friendship campaigns.

Like all people of the world, the meeting's participants recognized that nothing is more important for the people of Japan and the Soviet Union today than to defend peace, convinced that campaigns for the defense of peace and for disarmament and against nuclear weapons through concerted efforts with people of consistent goodwill can save our earth from a catastrophe.

The meeting's participants also recognized that, although the present situation in Japanese-Soviet relations is very severe, efforts to reduce discord and to promote cooperation in various fields for the development of Japanese-Soviet relations accord with the two peoples' interests and help to build confidence and [words indistinct] in the Far East, and strengthen peace and security in Asia and the whole world.

Participants from both sides confirmed that it is important to develop further, not merely preserve and solidify, positive gains made through efforts by a great number of people over many years in work for developing friendship between the peoples of Japan and the Soviet Union, as well as for goodneighborliness, mutual benefit, and cooperation between Japan and the Soviet Union, including the Soviet Far East and Hokkaido.

To attain these goals, the two sides decided to actively promote the expansion of political contacts, regional cooperation in the trade, fishery, economic, and cultural areas; exchanges in sports and tourism; and friendly exchanges between private organizations and sister cities in the Soviet Far East and Hokkaido.

Representatives from both sides participating in the meeting reached the conclusion that, to maintain confidence and [words indistinct] and strengthen friendly relations between the people of Japan and the Soviet Union, it will be beneficial and important to maintain dialogue between various circles and strata in the Soviet Far East and Hokkaido on questions related to mutually beneficial regional cooperation and good-neighborly relations in the Far East.

Both sides agreed to hold the next meeting, the second, in Hokkaido in 1985.

USSR-JAPAN TALKS ON SALMON FISHING OPEN

LD201145 Moscow TASS in English 1053 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS -- Talks have opened here today on Japanese salmon fishing in north-west Pacific.

Talks on salmon are rated among the issues in the field of fisheries, which have not yet been finally resolved by the two sides. Therefore, starting from the signing in 1978 of an agreement on fisheries between the USSR and Japan, talks are annually held on salmon on the eve of the fishing season.

Setting forth the Soviet stand at these talks, the head of the Soviet Delegation Yuriy Bystrov, USSR deputy minister of fisheries, stressed that it is necessary to take effective measures for preserving the number of salmon fish species, up to full suspension of their fishing at sea.

TRADE MINISTER GREETS JAPAN BUSINESS EXECUTIVE

LD131450 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT 13 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 13 TASS -- Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Nikolay Patolichev received the president of the Japanese firm "Marubeni Corporation" K. Haruna, a prominent representative of Japan's business community. They held a conversation on issues pertaining to the development of business relations between Soviet foreign trade organizations and the firm.

NEW JAPANESE ARMS BUILD-UP PROGRAM EXAMINED

'Accomplice' Role Seen

LD221203 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 22 Apr 84

[Text] Tokyo April 22 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Logachov reports:

The National Defense Agency of Japan is starting the development of a new large-scale arms buildup program. The head of the agency Yu. Kurihara held a press conference yesterday at the Japanese Army base in the city of Wakkanai (Hokkaido). He pointed out there that in the coming days he would order that that the working out of a five-year plan of military preparations for 1986-1990 be started. Kurihara, who is making an inspection tour of the military garrisons of Hokkaido told journalists that the program would devote the main attention to the qualitative improvement of the defense potential with the help of the most up-to-date military technology. This means that the efforts of the Japanese companies which fulfil the orders of the agency will be concentrated on creating ever more sophisticated death-carrying weapons -- new tanks, planes, missiles, etc.

Yuko Kurihara expressed readiness at the press conference to share the details of the ambitious plans worked out by the Japanese military with Caspar Weinberger who is going to visit Japan in May. The Washington administration, and primarily the head of the Pentagon, closely follow the creation in Japan of a powerful war machine and often introduce some changes in this process with the aim to use the militaristic actions of Tokyo in their global strategy. The U.S. started recently to impose on its Far Eastern ally the "defense" of a vast zone in the western part of the Pacific in order to set itself free for preparing military ventures in other parts of the world. Japanese ruling circles do not reject this role of accomplices of the aggressor. This follows, among other things, from the information about the future military program of the National Defense Agency which infiltrated into the press. The preparation of the Navy for conducting combat operations within the range of 1,000 nautical miles off the Japanese shores will be one of its chief items. According to the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI, it is also planned to substantially consolidate the armoured troops and to equip them with new tanks of the "TKH" type.

Military Satellites Featured

LD200833 Moscow TASS in English 0728 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Tokyo April 20 TASS -- Primary attention in the new five-year programme for the build-up of Japan's Armed Forces for 1986-1990 will be given to the development and creation of military satellites. This is reported today by the newspaper DAILY YOMIURI with reference to the country's National Defence Agency. The newspaper points out that the National Defence Agency intends to use spacecraft widely for gathering intelligence data and for ensuring communication between land and naval forces which make preparations for combat operations on the Pacific Ocean transportation lanes. The newspaper reports that the National Defence Agency has already taken under its control the information which is received from the earlier launched Japanese satellites. Two spacecraft specially designed to observe a vast area of the Asian-Pacific region with a view to gathering strategic data are planned to be launched into orbit in 1987 and 1990. The newspaper points out that this basically contradicts the parliament's resolution which made it binding upon the government to use outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

NURIYEV GREETS MPR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS' MAYDAR

PM181009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Apr 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Delegation's Arrival"]

[Text] A Mongolian Government delegation arrived in Moscow 16 April to attend the regular session of the Soviet-Mongolian Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation. The delegation is headed by D. Maydar, member of the MPRP Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the Mongolian Council of Ministers.

At the airport the delegation was met by Z.N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials. Z.N. Nuriyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, met D. Maydar, member of the MPRP Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the Mongolian Council of Ministers, 17 April and had a talk with him about the further development of economic cooperation between the USSR and Mongolia. The talk was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

DPRK MILITARY ATTACHE HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE

SK190045 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 18 Apr 84

[Text] Today, (?Major General) (Kim Hak-song), military attache of the DPRK Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Soviet Union, held a press conference on the occasion of the 52d anniversary of the founding of the Korean People's Army.

DPRK YOUTH ART TROUPE VISITS SOVIET UNION

SK150122 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 13 Apr 84

[Text] At the invitation of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union Komsomol, a DPRK youth art troupe arrived in the Soviet Union. The art troupe is composed of the art teams of various enterprises, offices, and institutions of people's Korea. The repertoires of the art troupe consists of Korean folk songs, patriotic songs, songs composed by Soviet composers, and [words indistinct]. The Korean guests will perform at plants, state and cooperative farms in and around Moscow, and tour Poltava in the Ukrainian SSR.

PRK FOREIGN MINISTRY WARNS THAIS ON POL POT AID

LD201030 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Phnom Penh April 20 TASS -- Kampuchean refugee camps in Thailand serve as a cover for subversive activities of Pol Pot men and other Khmer reactionary groupings against the People's Republic of Kampuchea, says the statement issued here by the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

With the knowledge of the Thai authorities, the statement stresses, the camps have been turned into military bases with headquarters of Pol Pot men, their arms and ammunition depots. Armed reactionary gangs launch sorties from their camps into the territory of the People's Republic of Kampuchea with the direct support of Thai artillery and the Air Force. Bangkok has granted the Pol Pot men an opportunity to receive through the Thai port Chinese weapons and has actually turned the Kampuchean refugee camps in its territory into a fortified military line along the border with the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

The People's Republic of Kampuchea guided by the wish to create conditions for the return of refugees home offers the Thai side to hold talks on that issue. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea demands respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Kampuchea. If provocative actions are continued the whole responsibility for their consequences will be held by the Thai authorities, says the statement by the Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

U.S. ARMS FOR ASEAN DIRECTED AGAINST INDOCHINA

BK190620 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia 1330 GMT 17 Apr 84

[Oleg Alekseyev commentary: "U.S. Militaristic Diplomacy in Southeast Asia"]

[Text] Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon has made an official visit to Washington. One of the main themes of the Thai prime minister's discussions with high-ranking U.S. officials, including U.S. President Ronald Reagan, was the large-scale delivery of U.S. weapons to Thailand and other ASEAN countries.

As reported, the United States expressed the desire to provide Thailand with the modified F-16 jet fighters, known as the Fighting Falcon or F-20 Tiger Shark jet. Singapore is now buying F-16 fighters worth $280 million to supplement the Hawkeye AWACS squadron. According to Thai press reports, the United States intends to pressure Thailand into accepting an arms delivery worth $1.7 billion. Considering the supply of U.S. weapons to other ASEAN countries, the amount of U.S. arms business in Southeast Asia is now unprecedented.

In the meantime, the United States is trying to concoct a thesis that the ASEAN countries themselves are initiating the arms transaction as a result of the so-called increasing threat in the region posed by Indochinese countries. This thesis, which has been nonsense from the beginning, was again unleashed during discussions between U.S. officials and the Thai prime minister.

It is no secret that in all diplomatic contacts between the United States and ASEAN countries in the last few years, the United States has exerted pressure on them with a view to expanding the military programs of those countries.

This was true during the visits of the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Vessey, Commander of the U.S. Forces in the Pacific Admiral Crow, and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to Southeast Asian countries. Pentagon boss Caspar Weinberger, THE INDONESIAN TIMES states, has been to the ASEAN countries to urge them to increase their military budgets and to pay for U.S. combat techniques.

When doubts were aired in ASEAN capitals on the need for a new round of the arms race, U.S. diplomats sometimes showed an intimidating attitude. This was true, for example, following the visit by Indonesian Armed Forces Commander Benni Murdani to Vietnam. After visiting Hanoi, General Murdani said that Vietnam not only posed no threat to Southeast Asia, but it also had similar objectives to those of the ASEAN countries. Gen Murdani's statement was also supported by Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja. Simultaneously, the United States gave its reaction.

In effect underlining the statement of the Indonesian leadership, U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Dam launched a blatant attack against the SRV and its policy toward neighboring countries.

Overseas pressure on ASEAN was especially stepped up when the Indochinese countries came out with constructive proposals to normalize the situation in the region by a policial dialogue. It was no coincidence, because U.S. arms deliveries to Southeast Asia were meant by the United States not only as a means to strengthen its partners' defense but also as a method of politico-military destabilization.

The delivery of U.S. F-16 and Hawkeye aircraft to Thailand, Singapore, and the Philippines, MERDEKA writes in this connection, has nothing to do with the actual defense needs of those countries. A U.S. strategic scheme is behind the realization of such a plan, MERDEKA concludes. What is the essence of this scheme? By convincing ASEAN countries of the need to arm themselves, the Thai paper BANGKOK WORLD points out, U.S. war strategists hope to involve them more in the strategic scheme. The problem is not limited either, for an increase in U.S. arms delivery will result in an increasingly growing dependence of the ASEAN countries on the United States. In accordance with the plan of Pentagon war strategists, the delivery of spare parts from the United States and the presence of U.S. military instructors is expected to facilitate control over ASEAN policies.

The foreign-inspired arms race is making political dialogue more difficult in the framework of establishing goodneighborly relations and mutually beneficial cooperation between ASEAN and Indochinese countries. Stability and goodneighborly relations in the region serve the interests of all Southeast Asian people and not only that of the U.S. ruling circles.

It is no coincidence that the U.S. press believes that with the delivery of the F-16 jet fighters to Thailand, the fighters will be the first in the Thai armament system that will be able to reach Hanoi.

The United States does not conceal the fact that the U.S. arms delivery is meant to exert military pressure on Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea. This also implies the use of Singapore and Thailand in providing Pol Potists and other anti-PRK bands with modern weapons. The bandits, who are sent in from outside Kampuchea, continuously launch provocations against the PRK. Under U.S. pressure, Thai troops are increasingly involved in the fighting. Under these circumstances, the large-scale U.S. arms delivery could result in more confrontations, which will only benefit U.S. politicians, who have not yet renounced the idea of redeeming the failure of their Indochina intervention.

The price which must be paid by Thailand for the U.S. aircraft is not limited to millions of dollars. The transaction has amounted to Thailand's direct participation in the U.S. strategy of trying to prevent the normalization of relations between ASEAN and Indochinese countries, THE TIMES OF INDIA writes in the wake of the U.S.-Thai talks in Washington.

U.S. 'UNLAWFUL CONDUCT' IN MICRONESIA CRITICIZED

LD211706 Moscow World Service in English 1431 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Excerpts] UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL reports, with reference to a Pentagon official, that the United States had conducted another test flight of its intercontinental ballistic Minuteman III missile from an air base on United States territory. The missile was fired in the direction of the Kwajalein atoll in the southwest of the Pacific. Our observer Viktor Valentinov writes the following in this connection:

America's military preparations in Micronesia are in full swing. Observers believe that now, when Washington's ally Japan is preparing to take the patrolling of the northwestern part of the Pacific upon itself, the Pentagon purposefully moves its outposts increasingly closer to Southeast Asia, which lies at the junction of the Pacific and Indian Oceans. At the same time, the Reagan administration is seeking to legitimize the presence of its Armed Forces in Micronesia by gradually annexing local territories.

The Soviet Union has drawn the attention of the United Nations to the unlawful conduct of the United States in Micronesia more than once. Washington, in its attempts to irrevocably turn the region into its military and strategic beach-head, keeps pressing long term military agreements on the local people under which it is going to build new naval bases, airfields, nuclear weaponry depots and other military facilities on the islands. The Soviet mission to the United Nations sent a letter to the UN secretary general late last month stating that the unlawful actions towards Micronesia carried out by the United States are a serious threat to the security of countries adjoining the region and to world peace as a whole.

POLAND'S SIWICKI, DELEGATION CONCLUDE VISIT

Visit Armored Unit

LD211356 Warsaw PAP in English 1100 GMT 21 Apr 84

[By PAP correspondent Leslaw Kolijewicz]

[Text] Moscow, 20 April -- Today, the Polish Army delegation, led by alternate member of the PUWP CC Political Bureau and National Defence Minister General Florian Siwicki, continued its official visit of friendship to the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

While in the Socialist Republic of the Ukraine, the delegation -- accompanied by commander-in-chief of the United Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty, Soviet Union's first deputy defence minister, and Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov -- visited an armoured unit to watch attacks by mechanized sub-units backed by aircraft and artillery in one of the testing ground training centres in that district.

These exercises were a splendid show of combat capability of Soviet soliders, their high level of training and commanding skills.

Addressing a rally of Polish-Soviet friendship and brotherhood-in-arms on behalf of the Polish delegation, Chief of the General Staff of the Polish Army and Vice-Minister of National Defence General Jozef Uzycki stressed that fraternal cooperation of both armies, consolidated for years, their mutual confidence, the awareness of common duty to defend security and socialist development of both nations are nowadays an important factor of defensive force of the entire socialist community.

Taking the floor during the rally, Marshal of the Soviet Union Viktor Kulikov emphasized the significance of the present visit by the Polish Army delegation to the USSR and voiced conviction that it will be of great importance for further strengthening of Polish-Soviet friendship and brotherhood-in-arms, and the development of the all-round mutual cooperation in the interests of consolidating defensive power of the Warsaw Treaty states.

Visitors Depart for Home

LD211402 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] The military delegation of the Polish People's Republic, headed by General Florian Siwicki, candidate member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and Polish minister of national defense has visited one of the units of the red banner-bearing Kiev Military District. A meeting with the personnel was held at which divisional General Uzycki, Polish deputy minister of national defense and chief of the General Staff of the Polish Army, and Kulikov, USSR first deputy minister of defense, commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact states, and marshal of the Soviet Union, made speeches.

The guests visited tactical batallion exercises and acquainted themselves with the life and activities of the servicemen. The members of the delegation viewed an exposition of the Kiev branch of the Central Vladimir Ilich Lenin Museum. The visited the Ukraine state museum of the history of the Great Patriotic War 1941-45, where many exhibits are devoted to the combat fraternity of Soviet and Polish servicemen, which was engendered in the joint struggle against fascism.

The military delegation of the Polish People's Republic today flew home from Kiev. They had been in our country at the invitation of the Soviet Government on an official visit.

MOSCOW HAILS FRIENDSHIP, ALLIANCE WITH POLAND

LD212010 Moscow in Polish to Poland 1400 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] Our observer Boris Rodionov writes:

Thirty-nine years ago, at the threshold of the great victory over fascism, a document was signed in Moscow which -- in precise wording appropriate in international law -- defined the relations of good neighborliness, mutual assistance, and alliance between the Soviet Union and Poland. A further strengthening of good-neighborly and friendly relations is in the vital interests of the Soviet and Polish peoples, reads the preamble of the treaty. The treaty was a culmination of the long and complicated history of Russian-Polish relations, over which a dark shadow had been cast for many centuries by the egotism of the ruling classes, as well as by the intervention of imperialist forces.

It is known that on 31 December 1944, the Polish Committee of National Liberation [PKWN] was transformed into a provisional government which was immediately recognized by the Soviet Union. It was precisely with that government -- the first authentic people's government in Poland's history -- that the Soviet Union signed a treaty of friendship, mutual assistance, and post-war cooperation on 21 April 1945. As a result of persistent efforts by Soviet diplomacy, including talks at the highest level shortly after that, Poland achieved international recongnition. The conference in Potsdam reaffirmed its borders along the Odra and Nysa and on the Baltic.

The 1945 treaty and the subsequent 1965 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance were of fundamental significance that reached far beyond the borders of the two neighboring countries. These documents became one of the most important elements of the allied system of the countries of socialism and one of the vital factors for political stability in Europe. This became particularly clear during the period of difficult trials which befell Poland in recent years. In accordance with a strategy worked out in Washington, a creeping counterrevoltuion was at first to emaciate the essence of the Polish-Soviet allied ties and then to turn Poland into the detonator of a new large-scale conflict planned for Europe. But the counterrevolution did not pass. Attempts to revive the Polish question, historically resolved once and for all, suffered a fiasco. The Soviet-Polish friendship and our poltical and economic ties have withstood all these tests.

The words recently spoken by Comrade Wojciech Jaruzelski from the platform of the PZPR National Delegates Conference brought joy to the Soviet people. He said: We will not forget this aid from the Soviet comrades and people. It has enabled us to survive the worst. Today, it allows us to think more calmly about the future. Yes, this is true. People's Poland's future within the Soviet-Polish alliance and the Warsaw Pact is safely guaranteed.

But it is necessary to fight for a peaceful sky above us. Together with its allies and friends, Poland resolutely comes out against Washington's attempts to break the military-strategic balance, and also unmasks the activity by revanchist forces in West Germany. Just as the Soviet Union, Poland deems the raising of the combat readiness of the armies of the fraternal countries and the further strengthening of the Warsaw Pact to be a crucial task. That was the central idea of the recent talks held in Moscow by a Polish military delegation led by General Florian Siwicki, minister of national defense.

The Soviet people value the friendship and alliance with People's Poland and are glad that the fraternal country is gradually emerging from its state of crisis.

Party and state contacts, as well as contacts which link individual brotherly oblasts and voivodships, friendship societies, creative associations, and direct partner enterprises are also developing favorably. The task for today is to further raise the effectiveness of our cooperation, both on a bilateral and multilateral basis within CEMA. We are fully justified in the assumption that new possibilities and prospects in this direction will be opened up through a planned economic conference of CEMA member-states at the highest level.

RECEPTION HELD FOR 'DAYS OF POLISH CULTURE'

LD202341 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Excerpts] "Days of Polish Culture" are continuing in our country.

The USSR Ministry of Culture arranged a reception today in honor of the participants in the "Days of Polish Culture." Present was the republic's official delegation led by Comrade Czyrek, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, and from the Soviet side, Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture, leaders of state and public organizations, and cultural figures.

BTA STATEMENT DENIES MISSILES IN BULGARIA

LD202237 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Sofia, April 20 TASS -- A statement of the BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY has been distributed here.

In the recent time, it is said in the statement, mass media of some West European countries assert that Soviet nuclear missiles have been deployed on the territory of the People's Republic of Bulgaria or that preparations are underway for deploying such missiles spearheaded against its neighbours -- Italy and North Africa.

The BULGARIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY is authorised to declare that these reports are absolutely groundless. In the People's Republic of Bulgaria there are neither nuclear medium-range missiles nor tactical missiles. The question of deployment of Soviet nuclear missiles on Bulgaria's territory has not been raised and has not been discussed at any level or forum.

The reports which appeared are a fabrication of those circles in the West which set the aim to divert the attention of the world public from realisation of their plans of deployment of new American medium-range missiles in some West European countries, plans of preparations for a nuclear war.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the statement stresses, is fully determined to uphold peace, to promote establishment of relations of mutual understanding and cooperation with all countries. The People's Republic of Bulgaria is engaged in vigorous activities aimed at turning the Balkan Peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. Attainment of that goal would thwart the NATO's plans in that region.

BULGARIAN PARTY DELEGATION VISITS KAZAKHSTAN

GF221144 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 0110 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] In accordance with a plan on the necessary links between the CPSU and the Bulgarian Communist Party, a delegation of Bulgarian party workers paid a visit to Alma-Ata 18-19 April.

The delegation consisted of Popov, chief of the Transport and Communications Department of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee; (Pandev), secretary of the Burgas Okrug Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party; and other responsible workers.

The delegation familiarized itself with the experience of the party leadership and activity of the transport and communications enterprises. The guests visited the party committee of the Alma-Ata railroad administration, the automation system center controlling the movement of buses in the republic's capital, the [word indistinct] training center of civil aviation and sites of interest in the city.

The delegation visited the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee yesterday and held a discussion with Kazybayev, secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee.

LCY'S MARKOVIC SCORES ALIEN IDEAS, VACILLATION

PM191349 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Apr 84 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Belgrade, 18 Apr -- D. Markovic, president of the LCY Presidency, has addressed a plenum of the Belgrade City Conference of the LCY here.

The struggle to consolidate the LCY's unity and adhere to the principle of democratic centralism must be at the focus of attention in party work, he declared. D. Markovic noted further that the Communists must in no way condone the attempts to oppose the party's political line. A passive attitude is impermissible on this issue. The LCY must constantly monitor the execution of adopted decisions and single out those who fail to accomplish the set tasks. Those speaking against the party's policy must get out of the LCY.

The speaker pointed out that vacillations are occurring in the sphere of the LCY's ideological activity, and there have been instances of the infiltration of ideas alien to self-management and socialism. The Communists must constantly struggle against nationalist and other antisocialist phenomena and promptly eliminate the reasons behind them.

The struggle for economic stabilization, D. Markovic stressed, must be the concern of all. We cannot allow the achievements in the country's development to be denied, nor any attempts to undermine the socialist system. There is no place for vacillation or deviation from the course of economic stabilization. Political consistency and a responsible attitude toward the work at hand are required from Communists. The LCY must consistently struggle to implement the stabilization program. Its implementation will also require efforts by all working people and citizens.

GROMYKO, ITALIAN FOREIGN MINISTER BEGIN TALKS

LD230838 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 23 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow, April 23 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and Giulio Andreotti, minister of foreign affairs of Italy, began talks in the Kremlin today. The Italian minister arrived in Moscow yesterday at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

FRANCE PLANS ANTISATELLITE DEFENSE SYSTEM

LD201042 Moscow in French to Europe 1730 GMT 19 Apr 84

[Boris Tumanov commentary]

[Text] The U.S. program of deploying antimissile defense systems in space could destabilize the balance between East and West. It is in the interest of humanity as a whole that the United States not create another dimension to the arms race.

You have just heard the opinion of Mr Manfred Woerner, FRG minister of defense, and it should be said that I entirely share this opinion. THE WASHINGTON POST, which brings us these words, adds that FRG officials express strong concern over the fact that Washington has practically excluded all possibility of concluding an agreement with the Soviet Union in the future on prohibiting the deployment in space of weapons known as antisatellite satellites.

As to the Soviet position on this problem, it is well-known. Moscow is resolutely against the militarization of space and says it is ready to sign an agreement to this effect at any time. However, officials of the French Ministry of National Defense chose this moment to announce to the world that France is working on designing a laser weapon that can be used as an offensive as well as defensive weapon. According to the weekly EXPRESS, this antisatellite weapon could become operational within 5 years. The "I's" have been dotted by President of Aerospatiale (Henri Marthre), who told representatives of the international press that the new French ballistic missiles, on which studies are presently being carried out, will, of course, be built in such a way as to be invulnerable to a laser attack or attack by [word indistinct] rays. In other words, France, in the fashion of the United States, is preparing for star wars. It intends to [words indistinct] weapons, which would allow it to attack with the guarantee of being able to pierce the enemy's defense system while remaining invulnerable to a possible counterattack.

Now we must ask the question: Against whom [words indistinct] these weapons in France? An eager soul would reply: Against nobody; this is just an additional expression of France's independence, and it is free to choose the ways in which to defend itself. We already have our atomic bomb, have we not? However, this time the situation is not at all the same. France created its own atomic weapon at a time when the United States and the Soviet Union already had one. Today, on the other hand, France is preparing to create a destabilizing weapon at the same time the United States has already made the decision to produce the same weapon and when the Soviet Union is doing all it can to avoid the militarization of space. The United States and France are thus the only ones to want to possess cosmic weapons. Must we conclude that France (?took this action) because it intends to keep itself safe from a possible U.S. attack or, on the contrary, to attack the United States? This supposition is laughable, is it not?

So, you must not be surprised to learn that the Soviets consider that the French cosmic weapon is trained on them, all the more so because France follows the United States step by step in the arms race. It does this at a time when even the most orthodox of Washington's allies are exhorting it to stop.

I would not like to be lacking in tact, but the ease with which the French Government officials waste money at the fancy of a new U.S. militaristic whim is even more incomprehensible to me when I remember that Mr Mauroy preached to France about 2,450,000 unemployed towards the end of the current year. Looking at things clearly, we must observe that France is preparing to make weapons designed to (?force) a defense system that does not exist, at least in the place toward which her new missiles are directed. Shall we be allowed in this [word indistinct] event to take into account at least France's intentions? If the FRG defense minister finds that U.S. cosmic weapons are a factor that unbalances the correlation of forces between East and West, I believe that there is no reason to apply a different criteria in judging French weapons of the same type. If one were tempted to retell the story of the independence of the French decision, I would say that only the United States will be equally independent. However, it is not the president of Barbados who will be making a decision for the president of the United States. No joke? But what does that change for the Soviet Union?

FRENCH MEDIA REPORTS ON AEROFLOT COURSE 'FALSE'

LD210748 Moscow in Italian to Italy 1700 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] A few days ago, the French media disseminated another false anti-Soviet item. This time, it is a piece of news which says that an Aeroflot TU-134 plane flying from Moscow to Marseilles allegedly deviated from its course for reconnaissance purposes.

The absurdity of this (?information), our observer Mikhail Dobrov writes, is so obvious that there is no difficulty in denying it. The thorough study of onboard documents, and of the taped radio contacts with the French air traffic controllers have shown that the TU-134 respected all the air traffic regulations in force on the French territory and did not deviate even a meter from the course recommended by the national air traffic controllers.

This was also recognized by the French authorities, who said they had nothing to reproach the Soviet crew for. On behalf of the French Government, a statement was also published which explained that the Soviet plane adhered to the course indicated by the French ground control center.

In connection with this, one is immediately led to ask why was this crude and false anti-Soviet (?information) disseminated? Because of insufficient information? No, not at all. This provocation was undertaken to accuse the Soviet Union of an unfriendly act towards France.

Along with this information, other fabrications were and are being disseminated by the bourgeois press in West European countries, particularly the rumors of the appearance of Soviet sumbarines in the coastal waters of some Baltic countries and even of some Mediterranean ones; or the unfounded assertions on the (?involvement) of Bulgaria and the Soviet Union in the attempt on the pope's life; or, finally, the old insinuations of mythical Soviet agents being behind antimissile demonstrations and peace marches in West European countries.

All these malicious rumors come from various sources, but, as a rule, the authors are the special services of the United States.

It is true that these malicious rumors are also fabricated in the government departments of West European countries, as happened in said case, in which, the author and director of the information on the espionage of the Soviet plane was the French state television, TF-1. This anti-Soviet invention does not honor the French television. By originating such ill-intentioned disinformation, the French state television encourages the activity of those circles that seek, at any cost, to harm the development of normal relations among all countries of the continent, no matter what their social system.

U.S. ACCUSED OF TRYING TO DRAG SPAIN INTO NATO

LD202032 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 1900 GMT 19 Apr 84

[Text] On his return from Washington, Defense Minister Narciso Serra said that in his portfolio he had 15 American proposals on close military cooperation between Spain and the United States, and, as though endorsing this statement, there followed frequent visits to Madrid by military chiefs from the other side of the Atlantic. At the beginning of April, U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense William Taft held negotiations in the Spanish capital. They discussed the reciprocal supply of war materiel, including U.S. surface-to-air missiles, antitank missiles and electronic military installations. Two days after the visit by Taft, General Charles Gabriel, chief of staff of the USAF, appeared in Madrid. The talks centered on the dispatch to Spain of 72 F-18A fighter-bombers and the training of pilots in the handling of these very new aircraft of the NATO arsenals. This is evidence of the continuing extension of military cooperation between Spain and Washington.

The Reagan administration makes no secret of its intention to drag Spain into the orbit of the militarist policy of the United States and NATO, guaranteeing the Pentagon permanent access to important objectives on Spanish territory and extending its military presence in the Pentagon bases in the Iberian Peninsula.

Following the meeting between President Reagan and Defense Minister Serra, a White House spokesman plainly stated that Washington wants to use its bases in Spain more effectively. In particular, the United States intends to station the so-called Rapid Deployment Forces on its bases in Spain to control the Mediterranean flank of NATO. U.S. F-18A aircraft will be stationed at one of its bases -- the one in Zaragoza. This was agreed during the negotiations held in Madrid by Gen Gabriel, chief of staff of the USAF. However, the Americans are striving for something else. As is known, after the extension of the so-called Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation, Washington extended the sphere of its interests to new areas of the Atlantic, including the Canary Islands. According to the weekly CAMBIO 16, the Pentagon aims to create a base for the Rapid Deployment Forces on the islands. U.S. military chiefs, the magazine continues, are prepared to negotiate the construction of the new air base with the Spanish. In developing military cooperation with Spain, asking Madrid to let it increase its military presence in the country and actively participating in the modernization of the Spanish Armed Forces in accordance with Atlantic standards, Washington is actually pursuing its main objective: to drag Spain into the military organization of NATO. It is precisely from this point of view that the Pentagon views the visits by its representatives to Madrid and, of course, the U.S. Administration does not care about the appeals from its Spanish partner to give new content to the Treaty of Friendship, which reflects principles of equal cooperation, including economic cooperation. There is nothing to be said about this cooperation -- Spain's deficit in its trade with the United States, which exceeds $2 billion, says everything.

FRG PARLIAMENTARIAN DENIES USSR MILITARY SUPERIOR

LD230952 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMt 23 Apr 84

[Text] New Delhi, April 23 TASS -- Gert Bastian, a deputy to the West German Bundestag, describes as unfounded the statements made in the U.S.A. and other Western capitals to the effect that NATO countries must arm themselves in the face of what they call Soviet military superiority over themselves.

Speaking in an interview with the Indian news agency PTI, Gert Bastian said that such statements were not true. The West German parliamentarian said that it had been proved many times that the United States and other NATO countries had much bigger weapon stockpiles than the Warsaw Treaty member-states.

Gert Bastian said that the peace movement in West Germany was bitterly opposed to the military doctrines of the Reagan administration, regarding them as a threat to international peace. As the arms race continued, he said, the threat of a world-wide nuclear conflict was increasing manyfold. He added that the threat was looming dark not only over Central Europe but also the entire world, including non-aligned countries.

'MAMMOTH' ANTIWAR RALLY HELD IN HAMBURG

LD230659 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 23 Apr 84

[Text] Bonn, April 23 TASS -- A mammoth anti-war meeting was held in the FRG's biggest city and port, Hamburg, on Sunday, within the framework of traditional spring "peace marches." They are being held all over West Germany under the sign of determination of the public to continue the struggle against the FRG's territory being turned into a launch-pad for new American first-strike nuclear missile systems, the struggle against the aggressive course of the USA and NATO, for disarmament and mutual understanding between nations.

More than 20,000 people converged in ten columns in a star-shaped formation on Hamburg's central square. A speech at the meeting was made by member of the Hamburg Senate (government) Jan Ehlers (Social Democratic Party of Germany). He denounced deployment of American Pershing-2 and cruise missiles as preparation for a war of aggression and demanded that realisation of the NATO's nuclear missile decisions be stopped and turned back, that the American missiles already deployed be withdrawn from the West German territory.

According to the data of anti-war organizations, more than 80,000 people took part in "peace marches" alone in Hamburg.

ANTIWAR PROTEST MARCH BEGINS IN BELGIUM

LD231201 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 23 Apr 84

[Text] Brussels, April 23 TASS -- The participants in the march of protest against plans of deployment in Belgium of American medium-range nuclear missile weapons today set off on their way from the railway terminal in Gent in the north of Belgium. The march is planned to be completed on April 28 in Florennes where the Pentagon plans to deploy 48 American cruise missiles.

The march of protest has been initiated by two leading anti-war organizations of the country -- The National Committee of Actions for Peace and Development and the Flemish Committee of Actions Against Atomic Weapons. Both organizations sent a message to all candidates for deputies to the European Parliament from Belgian parties. In the message, it is noted that though there is no official decision by the government on deployment of missiles, preparatory work to receive them is in full swing at the Florennes air base.

BRITISH GOVERNMENT SEVERS TIES WITH LIBYA

LD221944 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 22 Apr 84

[Text] London April 22 TASS -- The British Government tonight broke diplomatic relations with Libya, a news conference here was told by Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Richard Luce.

The decision by the British authorities followed an incident during a demonstration in front of the Libyan People's Bureau (embassy) in London on April 17. According to a letter sent by the Libyan Jamahiriyah to U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, British police allowed an attack on the people's bureau by unidentified persons of Middle East origin hostile to Libya, and then detained several Libyan diplomats. After that police units sealed off the bureau. The letter assessed these actions by the British authorities as contradicting international agreements and norms.

Shortly before taking the decision to break diplomatic ties with Libya, the British Foreign Office rejected Libya's proposal to send a commission to London to investigate the incident.

JERUSALEM COMMITTEE MEETING IN FES CONCLUDES

LD211050 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 21 Apr 84

[Text] Rabat April 21 TASS -- An extraordinary session of the Committee for Jerusalem on the level of foreign ministers has come to a close in Fes. Representatives of 14 Moslem countries and the Palestine Liberation Organization discussed the situation in the Middle East and measures to offset the conspiracy of U.S. imperialsim and the Zionist ruling circles of Israel. The recommendations adopted by the session point out the aggressive nature of the policy pursued by the White House in the Middle East and strongly denounce the military, political and financial assistance of the U.S. to Tel Aviv, as well as the encouragement by Washington of the construction of Israeli militarized settlements on occupied Arab lands.

Members of the committee bitterly attacked Washington's plan to transfer its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem whose eastern (Arab) part was illegally annexed by Israel. Participants in the Fes session pointed out that the opening of any foreign diplomatic mission in Jerusalem was a violation of the decisions of the world community and an open challenge to the Arab nations.

The documents adopted by the session contain demands that the terror and repressions of Israeli aggressors against the native population of the occupied Arab lands be terminated, that the destruction and desecration by Zionists of Moslem and Christian strines be stopped, that the troops of the invaders be immediately withdrawn from the occupied territories. Participants in the session urged all the Arab and other Moslem countries to pool their efforts for the struggle against the U.S.-Israeli intrigues in the Middle East

EGYPT SEVERS TIES WITH EL SALVADOR, COSTA RICA

LD220956 Moscow TASS in English 0804 GMT 22 Apr 84

[Text] Cairo April 2 TASS -- Egypt has decided to sever diplomatic relations with El Salvador and Costa Rica because these states transferred their embassies in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

SOVIET, INDIAN COSMONAUTS HOLD PRESS CONFERENCE

LD230926 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 23 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS -- TASS special correspondents report from the International Press Centre:

The flight of the Soviet-Indian international crew, consisting of Yuriy Malyshev, Gennadiy Strekalov and Indian researcher cosmonaut Rakesh Sharma, has logically continued and developed the two countries' long-standing cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space, Vladimir Kotelnikov, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, said today. He was speaking at a press conference here, which was devoted to the results of the international space mission.

The press conference was attended by prominent Soviet and Indian scientists, officials in charge of cosmonauts' training, senior executives from the mission control centre, the members of the international crew and their back-up team.

After recalling that the Soviet Union and India launched cooperation in studying outer space more than 20 years ago, Academician Kotelnikov went on to say that the jointly accumulated experience in this field has enabled India quickly to launch independent space studies. India today is the 7th country among the more than 150 U.N. member states, which is capable of launching its satellites into space with the help of its own booster rockets.

Kotelnikov, who chairs the Intercosmos council, stressed that the Soviet-Indian space experiment has won enthusiastic public acclaim in the Soviet Union and India and been highly assessed by the leaders of the two countries.

"Our expedition was short," Yuriy Malyshev, commander of the international crew, told the press conference. "But we have been able successfully to fulfill the entire program of diverse and instructive experiments, drawn up jointly by Soviet and Indian scientists in the interests of science and the national economies of the Soviet Union and India."

He said that all the seven days of work in orbit passed in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual assistance. This enabled the six cosmonauts aloft to work with maximum efficiency from the docking to the visiting crew's departure and fully complete the 43 planned scientific experiments. "Awareness that our flight was taking place shortly before Cosmonautics Day provided a special stimulus to all of us in our difficult work in orbit. It can be said that the Soviet-Indian expedition was illuminated with Gagarin's smile. We smiled to the planet as we thought about peace and about the future."

Gennadiy Strekalov, the crew's flight engineer, spoke highly of the operation of the entire technical complex in orbit. "We blasted off," he remined the newsmen, "in the spaceship 'Soyuz T-11'. I have been now traveled on three ships in this series. They provide a reliable airlift between earth and the scientific laboratory aloft. We went up in one but returned, as it was planned, in another spaceship. Our docking with the station went very economically, and we have left our ship with its unspent fuel reserves to our friends."

"Space has entered our life," Strekalov said, "not just as the accomplishment of scientific research programs and national economic development plans. It has entered the life of millions, changing their mentality and their ideas about the possibilities of mankind, about its might and at the same time about its responsibility for the fate of the planet. It is with this feeling that we worked in orbit together with India's first space son."

The attending journalists greeted Rakesh Sharma, researcher cosmonaut of the Soviet-Indian crew, with a storm of applause. Speaking in Russian, his voice betraying his emotion, he said: "Every day and minute of our flight, a flight that has hoisted the flag of my motherland high above earth thanks to the many years of fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and India, are unforgettable. I had heard many stories about space from my comrades in the stellar township, but reality excelled all my expectations. The link-up with the station 'Salyut-7' and the long-awaited meeting with its hosts was the most memorable moment to me."

Speaking about geophysical studies under an experiment called "Terra", the Indian cosmonaut pointed out their exceptional significance to his country's science and economy.

"I felt great excitement and joy when flying over my homeland," Rakesh Sharma said. "All of its contours I had known since childhood from maps and books seemed to come alive and transform into a living ship that was riding hurricanes and waves."

He said the expedition has proved so successful because he had "very good partners". "What I like best in my space comrades is their high professional standards, affability, unfailing composure and readiness to give advice or practical help at any moment," he said. "This has allowed us to demonstrate the real possibilities of peoples' friendly hand-shake on earth and in space and of their joint work to insure the happiness of the present and coming generations on our planet."

ORBITING COSMONAUTS CONTINUE ACTIVITIES

LD201144 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 20 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow April 20 TASS -- Leonid Kizim, Vladimir Solovyev and Oleg Atkov are continuing work in outer space orbit.

Over the past days, the crew of the orbital complex were busy unloading the cargo spaceship "Progress-20", installing and preparing for operation the delivered equipment. The cosmonauts transferred into the station containers with food, plants of the life-sustaining system, hygienic equipment and installed a new block of chemical batteries.

Orbit correction of the research complex has been carried out by means of the propulsion engine of the cargo spaceship. Its parameters at the present time are: miximum distance from the earth's surface -- 332 kilometres; minimum distance from the earth's surface -- 301 kilometres; period of revolution -- 90.6 minutes and inclination of the orbit -- 51.6 degrees.

One of the days of the past week was devoted to a medical check-up of the crew. The functional state of the cardio-vascular system and the physical work capacity of the cosmonauts were determined. According to the results of the medical check-up, Leonid Kizim, Vladimir Solovyev and Oleg Atkov feel well.

The flight of the orbital research complex "Salyut-7" -- "Soyuz T-11" -- "Progress-20" is proceeding normally.

Perform 4-Hour Space Walk

LD231123 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Apr 84

[From the Novosti newscast]

[Text] Comrades, we have just received this report from the flight control center:

The crew of the Salyut-7--Soyuz-T-11--Progress-20 is continuing to carry out the planned flight program. Today cosmonauts Leonid Kizim and Vladimir Solovyev went out into open space and carried out preparatory operations for work outside the station planned for the future.

At 0831 Moscow time [0431 GMT], the station's exit hatch was opened, and the commander and flight engineer went out into open space. They extracted a special folded ladder and containers holding tools and necessary materials from the station's transfer compartment, and then took them over to the site of the work. The cosmonauts unfolded the ladder and set it up on the exterior surface of the staion; the containers were also attached there.

Following this work and other preparatory operations, the cosmonauts went back inside the station. Leonid Kizim and Vladimir Solovyev were in open space for 4 hours 15 minutes.

Cosmonaut-researcher Oleg Atkov was in the station's work compartment during the cosmonauts' excursion, and checked the functioning of on-board systems, maintaining contact with the commander and flight engineer.

During the work in open space, flight control center conducted radio conversations with all members of the crew. During execution of all the work in open space and within the station, the crew of the orbital complex acted precisely, in complete accordance with the planned schedule.

'GORIZONT' COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE LAUNCHED

LD230744 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0707 GMT 23 Apr 84

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (TASS) -- In accordance with the program for further development of communications and television broadcasting systems through the use of artificial earth satellites, another "Gorizont" communications satellite was launched in the USSR on Sunday. It has been put into a circular near-stationary orbit with the following initial parameters: distance from the earth's surface -- 36,320 km [as received]; period of rotation about the earth -- 24 hours 23 minutes; inclination of orbit -- 11.4 degrees.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

ARMENIAN SCIENCE ACADEMY HOLDS ANNUAL MEETING

GF221845 Yerevan SOVETAKAN AYASTAN in Armenian 31 Mar 84 pp 1, 2

[Excerpts] In the decisions of the party's 26th congress and those of the CPSU Central Committee Plenums following the congress, an important place has been allocated to the scientific and technical progress of the entire national economic complex. Armenian scientists also make a notable contribution to the realization of these decisions. Practical talks were held on the scientists' successes and tasks in that field and the problems of the dimensional development of science during the general annual meeting of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences on 30 March.

Participating in the academy's general meeting were Comrades K. Demirchyan, B. Sarkisov, F. Sarkisyan, K. Dallakyan, L. Nersesyan, Armenian SSR Council of Ministers Deputy Chairman Y. Khodzhamiryan and G. Sagoyan, who prior to the meeting acquainted themselves with the activities of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences institutes and other scientific institutes and the exhibition taking place in the academy's hall.

The meeting was opened by V. Ambartsumyan, president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences.

V. Ambartsumyan noted the basic results of the academy's establishments, asserted their activities and outlined the tasks of the collectives in light of the modern demands. He said: One of the main tasks is the rapid implementation of achievements of science in national economy. During recent years a lot has been done in that field. However, the achievements cannot satisfy us. That particularly applies to the organizational side of the work, which often hinders the fast development of scientific breakthroughs. It is important to note here that the union ministries are displaying a greater interest in the scientific results of our institutes, are making efforts to use them, and are organizing special departments which are being operated by the administration of the Academy's institutes or in close cooperation with them. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about the individual ministries and departments of the republic.

G. Galoyan, academician-secretary of the republic's Academy of Sciences, spoke on the basic results of the scientific and organizational activities of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences in 1983.

He said: The accounting year was full of big turning points. During the June and December 1983 and February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenums, issues of vital importance to our prople and party were reviewed and the further socioeconomic progress of our country depends on their correct solution.

During 1983 scientific research has been carried out on 151 problems at the academy's establishments with 405 themes, including 295 themes in natural sciences and 109 themes in social sciences. A total of 62 themes projected by the plan have been completed. The institutes have carried out considerable work to link their activities to modern demands.

During the accounting year a number of practical steps have been taken to secure the scientific and technical progress and implement the achievements of science in the national economy. The Presidium has reviewed those issues and presented corresponding propositions to the republic's directive organs. The established plan includes numerous proposals, a part of which have already been implemented in production.

The future interests demand radical improvement in the preparation of young cadres by all our scientific research organizations. However, there are serious shortcomings in that issue. The thing is that the average age of the scientific youth is quite high. With the assistance of the Academy Presidium Council for the Preparation of Scientific Cadres and the Komsomol Central Committee Young Scientists and Specialists Council, the Presidium has reviewed the question on "The Perfection of the Work Carried Out With Regard to the Youths of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences Scientific Establishments." In order to encourage the work of young scientists, six awards and diplomas have been defined which will be presented every 2 years. From now on, one of the most important conditions for assessing the institutes' activities will be the result of the research of the young scientists.

A. Iosifyan, vice president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences, spoke on "A Number of Problems Regarding the Electrification of Armenian SSR Agriculture in Light of the Fulfillment of the USSR Food Program." He talked about the tasks to strengthen scientific work in the organization of economy and agro-industrial production; in the perfection of plants, genetics and selection of animals, fodder production and means to automate production; in the creation of new means and technology; and in the rational use of the republic's land resources.

The election of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences president was held. V.G. Ambartsumyan, prominent scientist and Hero of Socialist Labor, was elected president of the academy.

A.G. Gabrielyan, academician of the republic's Academy of Sciences, was elected academician-secretary of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences Earth Sciences Department.

BRIEFS

AWARDS TO ACADEMICIAN TSELIKOV -- For outstanding services in the development of Soviet engineering and in the training of scientific cadres, and on the occasion of his 80th birthday, Hero of Socialist Labor Academician Aleksandr Ivanovich Tselikov is awarded, by decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Order of Lenin and a second Hammer and Sickle Gold Medal. The labor feats of Hero of Socialist Labor Comrade Tselikov will be marked by placing a bronze bust in the Hero's hometown. [Text] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1419 GMT 20 Apr 84 LD]